

CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

FIP/SC.6/CRP.3
June 29, 2011

Meeting of the FIP Sub-Committee
Cape Town, South Africa
June 29 and 30, 2011

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND ANSWERS ON THE INVESTMENT PLAN SUBMITTED BY BURKINA FASO

BURKINA FASO FIP INVESTMENT PLAN

INDEPENDENT REVIEW COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Burkina Faso Government and MDBs would like to thank the reviewer for the thorough and enlightening review of the Burkina Faso Draft Forest Investment Plan, sent to him on 27th April.

Overall, we are happy to say that the comments are consistent with many others that we have received on this draft from reviewers’ in-country, MDBs and from development partners. The World Bank organized a quality review meeting that helped to improve the content and the quality of the investment plan. Thus the Final version of the investment plan submitted to the FIP sub-committee address, when possible, all comments received. Other comments will be taken into account at the stage of the preparation of the investment projects over the coming months.

The present matrix underlines how the team has addressed all received comments

INDEPENDENT REVIEW COMMENTS	TEAM RESPONSE
INTRODUCTION	
<p>Para 3. The proposed FIP is well elaborated, noticeably presented, comprehensible and – through detailed annexes and appendices (in French) – well documented. It generally acknowledges the national situation in natural resources management (NRM) and the past experiences in managing forests and rural landscapes. It constitutes a good basis for a longer-term focused work for building up a forest/landscape based strategy to mitigate GHG and for the preparation of policies and measures, which also addresses “co-benefits”, e.g. the wider sustainable development goals of poverty alleviation, environmental management and biodiversity conservation in (hot) semi-arid landscapes</p>	<p>The team acknowledges the appreciation of the FIP investment plan. The version that has been reviewed (dated April 27) has been improved and all appendices translated to English</p>
<p>Para 4. Nonetheless, the proposal can be strengthened in various ways. The focus on “forests” alone might not sufficiently take into account the real potential of REDD+ in low-forested landscapes in semi-arid habitats. The proponents might want to further explore the restoration and enhancement of carbon stock potential of wooded range lands/savannah and agroforestry parks (that cover more than 50% of the country). While in the proposal the positive effects of “reforestation and anti-desertification campaigns” are recognized, a wider landscape carbon approach has not been considered. The document should be more precise in respect to the methodology and scope of the REDD+ strategy and the investments that are</p>	<p>The team fully agree that restoration of trees in wooded rangelands and agro-forestry have considerable carbon sequestration potential as well as important co-benefits for pastoralists and agriculturalists. Agroforestry and Parklands are identified as a priority for the FIP and are part of the Project 1 which will support restoration of these landscapes using participatory approaches and will include development of a MRV system which would allow for a systematic assessment of GHG sequestration potential from different types of interventions in these landscapes.</p>

<p>needed in an integrated forest/landscape carbon approach. Such an approach needs to be understood and generally accepted by all concerned stakeholders to make it viable in the longer term. Applying widely recognized participatory approaches for FIP investments and the good understanding of the potentials and limitations of a REDD+ strategy by all relevant stakeholders in Burkina Faso are important prerequisites of FIP investments.</p>			
Part I: General criteria			
Criteria	Score	Comments	
Complies with the principles, objectives and criteria of the FIP as specified in the design documents and programming modalities	L	P, O & C of the FIP are taken into account and the linkages between the priority activities and the investment projects are well established.	
Takes into account the country capacity to implement the plan	L	Well embedded in existing approaches; Sufficiently described for project 2 and 3, less clear for project 1	This has been addresses. Please The team is confident that Burkina’s substantial experience in decentralized, participatory approaches to natural resource management constitutes a sound basis for implementation. We believe, however, that development of MRV approaches does require substantial capacity building and this will take time as it is the case in many other countries.
Developed on the basis of sound technical assessments	P	While generally well elaborated and documented in projects 1 and 2, project 3 is less convincing in its technical assessment; it is difficult to recognize innovation values in all three projects.	With regard to technical assessment for project 3, the team agree that the technical basis for value-chain enhancement will need to be assessed during project preparation and through development of agreed criteria for technical sub-project appraisal.
Demonstrates how it will initiate transformative impact	P	Forest and trees play an important role in the overall development strategy of Burkina Faso; the country has prepared sectoral strategies, along with a 10-year global investment plan for land, forest and watershed management. However,	With regard to innovation and transformative impact, we believe that the inter-linkages between elements of the program, decentralized, participatory approaches, value-chain development, the transition to lower carbon development in the rural economy, the establishment of MRV system within the framework of development of a REDD strategy based on the

		none of the 3 projects can yet convincingly demonstrate how it will initiate transformative impact under the FIP (give examples).	lessons of the program, the improvement of legislation, the proposed knowledge management framework, the learning and the focus on co-benefits are all important innovations. At the same time, we attach importance to “implementability” of the program and to building on existing experience.
Provides for prioritization of investments, stakeholder consultation and engagement, adequate capturing and dissemination of lessons learned, and monitoring and evaluation and links to the results framework	L	All three proposals are well elaborated and sufficiently clear in setting investment priorities; remarkable is the fact that the proposals are based on existing experience. A good rationale needs to be given for the prioritization of State forests (project. 2).	
Adequately addresses social and environmental issues, including gender	L	As a whole, the 3 projects focus on capacity building, particularly strengthening of local capacities	
Supports new investments or funding that is additional to on-going/planned MDB investments	L	FIP is a new investment and complementary to MDB investments and bilateral development cooperation. Innovative elements could be more valorized and the landscape approach could be better articulated.	
Takes into account institutional arrangements and coordination	F	Well embedded into an overall institutional concept, particularly also through joining NAPA/REDD+ and FIP under one single umbrella. The country has national and local expertise in natural resources management and can efficiently and effectively manage	

		FIP/REDD+ investments.	
Promotes poverty reduction	P	While the poverty reduction element is clearly articulated in project 1, projects 2 and 3 are less clear about these types of benefits.	With regard to poverty reduction, the intention is for project 2 to promote investment in community forests and woodlands, with poverty reduction impact; and for project 3 to increase employment diversification, with indirect impact on poverty reduction.
Considers cost effectiveness of investments	P	Difficult to assess with the information available. For projects 1 and 3 implemented by the World Bank, the budgets seem to include a 4-year supervision provision; this is not coherent with the other budgets (being national ones or AfDB). Moreover, the consulting services are 7 times higher in the World Bank proposal than in the AfDB proposal...	AfDB and government budgets for project 2 have been reviewed
Para6: The proposal complies with the criteria of the FIP. Nonetheless, the overall objective of the Burkina FIP (outlined in §56?) and referred to in §81 is not sufficiently well declared. Also, when referring to the definition of themes and priority areas under the FIP, the proposal says that it is based on “in depth analysis and wide-reaching consultations”; however, it is not further explained what “in-depth analysis” or wide-reaching consultations” really means; this need to be better articulated.			With regard to FIP objectives we believe that figure 1 places the objectives of the Burkinabe program well within the overall objectives of the FIP and national context. Please refer to annex 2 for a summary of the consultations, which build, however, on other consultation processes associated with related strategy formulation.
Part II: compliance with the investment criteria of the FIP			
Criteria	Score	Comments	
Climate change mitigation potential	P	Rough estimates are given, but full potential (landscape carbon) have not been explored. No time span is given for estimating the mitigation potential.	A scoping study launched by UNDP Burkina Faso in collaboration with the Designated National Authority (DNA) of Burkina Faso in 2007 shows that the total CO2 mitigation potential of the agriculture, forestry, waste, energy and transport sectors of the country is approximately 15 million tones of CO2 between now and 2015, distributed among sectors as shown in the graph below. Crudely assuming a price of \$10 per ton of CO2e, this represents a revenue potential of over \$150 million. Accurate information on the mitigation potential of different

			landscapes is lacking, and information on the biomass potential in particular of agricultural landscapes is particularly weak. The proposed FIP investment plan aims to address these issues through program implementation and development of the REDD strategy.
Demonstration potential at scale	L	REDD+ strategy developed hand-in-hand with the FIP development. Well defined pilots, comprehensive approach but yet not very innovative.	
Cost-effectiveness	(L)	Cannot be fully assessed with the information available. Leveraging additional resources, in particular from private sector is searched; no real references on carbon funding.	
Co-benefits	P	Capacities of social systems and (tree) ecosystems to CC adaptation measures are not sufficiently addressed; they play a crucial role in semi-arid climate zones.	Addressed. Given experience in other countries and the ongoing forest inventory work, we intend to complete this exercise in 3 years. We will also articulate and analyze thoroughly the social and the climate resilience co-benefits of the projects as we go through preparation and implementation, and will include indicators against which to measure progress.
Implementation potential	L	The 3 proposed projects are rather “classical” and can be based on a broad existing experience in the country. However, the innovation element is hardly recognizable.	
Natural forests	L	There are only few natural forests left; safeguard provisions could be developed for the wider role of trees in rural landscapes and for enhancement of carbon stocks.	
Para 16: Project 1: Decentralized Sustainable Forest Management (PGDDF)			We thank you for the observations which are helpful and we will address them during project preparation. Consistent with FIP guidelines, World Bank safeguards will apply.
Project 2: Participatory Management of State Forests (PGPD)			All comments have been addressed. AfDB safeguards will apply

Project 3: Forest Product utilization and value chains (FIP-PVPF-DF)	<p>para 18: build on traditional knowledge is reflected in the detailed project proposal. We are well aware of the importance of security of tenure and woodland based investments and it is also reflected in the proposal.</p> <p>para 19: the project preparation process will allow build stronger baseline indicators and benchmark indicators. We share your concern but are cautious about more precision until we have more detailed project designs in place.</p> <p>Para 20: We thank you for the recommendation to focus more on resilience/sequestration co-benefits, it is reflected in the propose</p>
PART III. RECOMMENDATIONS	
<i>Paras 21 through 23:</i>	We should note (para 22) that the FIP includes investments in agricultural landscapes, and pastoral landscapes. We hope that the current text clarifies this point. Furthermore the FIP proposes investments in degraded landscape restoration (project 1 and 2) which would enhance resilience as well as sequester carbon.
<i>Para 25 and 26</i>	we note the inconsistency in the terminology in the 27 th April text, and hope that the present text together with table 2 clarifies that trees in the production landscape are key to Burkina, and would form part of the FIP (through both projects 1 and 3).
Para 27	Addressed
<i>Para 28</i>	We note the examples of Kenya and Tanzania and look forward to learning from their experience during preparation of the REDD readiness strategy for Burkina.