

Project Name	Burkina Faso - National Natural Ecosystem Management
Region	Africa Region
Sector	Natural Resources Management
Project ID	BFPE52400
Borrower(s)	GOVERNMENT OF BURKINA
Implementing Agency	Address MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT & HYDRAULIC (DIR. EAUX ET FORET) Direction Générale des Eaux et Forêts Address: Direction Generale des Eaux et Forêts 03 BP 7044 Ouagadougou 03; Burkina Faso Contact Person: SAWADOGO Bobodo Blaise, Coordinator of preparation Tel: (226) 35 60 34 Fax: (226) 36 27 91 Email: bobodo.sawadogo@hotmail.com & bobodo.sawadogo@liptinfor.bf
Environment Category	B
Date PID Prepared	January 15, 2002
Projected Appraisal Date	October 11, 2001
Projected Board Date	April 11, 2002

1. Country and Sector Background

2. Main sector issues and Government strategy:

Biodiversity

Burkina Faso's species profile includes 655 wildlife species (mammals plus and birds); 330 aquatic species (including 121 fish species), and 1054 plant species (751 grass and 304 tree and brush species). Solid statistics on biodiversity trends are not available, but the facts are dire. Natural habitats -- Sudanian or Sahelian -- are now almost restricted to parks, reserves, and gazetted forests, which in total cover less than 10% of the country. Outside of these areas, large mammals and birds, not adapted to the disturbed environment, have almost disappeared. Agriculture has encroached on more than 70% of some areas, for example, Dida Forest. Poaching has decimated the population of game animals in most protected areas. Disturbance of nesting sites in wetland areas has led to the disappearance of migratory palearctic species such as the white stork. Some species, including the oryx, cheetah, and giraffe, are reported extinct in Burkina. The last Mali/Burkina redneck ostrich population may also be extinct. Others approaching extinction include the black and white colobus, dama gazelle, leopard, and topi.

Poverty in relation to Biodiversity

With a per capita GDP of US\$240 (1997), Burkina Faso is among the poorest countries in the world. It is: number 172 of the 175 countries in the UNDP's 1997 Human Development Index. Human resource indicators are extremely low: literacy 19% vs. 57% for Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), life expectancy 48 years vs. 52 years for SSA, and infant mortality 128/1,000 vs. 92/1,000 for SSA. Of Burkina's 10 million inhabitants, 84% live in rural areas. Nevertheless, per

capita GDP growth of 4.0% in 1995, 6.0% in 1996, 4.7% in 1997, and 6.2% in 1998 gives hope that Burkina Faso can maintain economic growth that will sustain reduction of poverty.

Overall incidence of absolute poverty is extremely high (45%) and is predominantly a rural phenomenon (51 % in rural areas vs. 16% in the cities). It is higher for subsistence farmers (77%) than for commercial farmers (42%). Nearly half the population lacks adequate food and essential goods and services. The poor spend 58 % of their budget on food, mainly millet and sorghum. Recurrent droughts cause food shortages and occasional famines. To survive, the poor rely on income diversification and complementary wild resources (for diet and pharmacopoeia)--a risk-management strategy widespread among men, and even more so among women, who engage in transformation of agricultural produce, small manufacturing, gathering of wild produce, and commerce. Migration is another way the poor cope with life-threatening circumstances and diffuses the pressure to the south, where "environmental refugees" are less and less welcomed.

Adverse climatic conditions, unfavorable geography, and low productivity of the agricultural sector in the most densely populated zone, coupled with over-exploitation of natural resources, are therefore considered the major constraints to economic growth. They exacerbate the widespread poverty, severe food insecurity, and degradation of globally important ecosystems.

Government strategies

The national operational strategies most relevant to PRONAGEN are the (1) 2001 Policy on Decentralized Rural Development, (2) 1995 reform of the wildlife and protected area sector, and (3) 2000 Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan.

(1) Decentralized Rural Development. Decentralization to the lowest level possible can play an important role by placing key decisions and funds in the hands of those who stand to win or lose from the results of development. Different from those of other countries, the Government of Burkina Faso has decided to adopt a slow pace of implementation, consistent with the country's limited capacity to manage such complex institution-building. The Letter of Policy on Decentralized Rural Development (June 2000) was drafted in support of the CBRDP. Its objectives include "to ensure rational management of natural resources.." It sets the stage for PRONAGEN because (1) decentralized communities have full responsibility for local development including the management of natural resources in their terroir and (2) Government technical services are refocused on the functions of conceiving and monitoring policies and law enforcement. The letter is to be implemented in two phases: (1) a transitory phase, which prepares effective implementation of decentralization, and (2) a final phase, which ends when decentralization is complete. The letter also proposes several sectoral reforms pertaining to the management of protected areas by village communities.

(2) Protected area and wildlife management. The 1995 reform had already increased private and community involvement in protected area management. At the time, Burkina undertook these reforms because it lacked financial resources to efficiently manage its parks, reserves, and wildlife areas. The reform was implemented in 1997 by a Forestry Code (Loi 006/97/ADP), which sets the National Forestry Policy as being founded on (1) conservation of biological diversity; (2) utilization of forest, wildlife, and fish resources for economic development and improvement of well being; (3) creation of employment and income for populations; and (4) participation and empowerment of population in the design, implementation, and monitoring of forestry activity through decentralized management of natural resources. It was followed in 1998 by the creation of 13 Wildlife Conservation Units across the national territory (Decision 98/017 MEE/CAB). The objective was to consolidate clusters of protected areas under the coordination of a Government-appointed conservator while delegating daily management and commercial use of protected areas to private "cessionnaires."

The concessionaires pay taxes to the Government and credit a "Collective Interest Fund" to benefit adjacent populations. The concessionaires must recruit licensed "safari or tourism guides" for commercial use.

(3) Biodiversity. The stated purpose of the Strategy is to "ensure responsible management of biological diversity by the populations by 2025." Among the approaches adopted are (1) participatory management / gestion des terroirs," (2) territorial planning at the landscape level, (3) programmatic approach for coherent national development, and (4) strengthening the decentralization process by building community capacity to manage natural resources. In applying the Strategy, the Action Plan aims to ensure (1) the conservation of important or threatened ecosystems/species, (2) sustainable use of biological resources, and (3) equitable sharing of benefits from sustainable use of resources. It states that threatened ecosystems and species can be conserved only with fully empowered populations. To achieve this, the Action Plan indicates that the legal framework will need to be revisited to ensure equitable sharing of biodiversity benefits and that an awareness campaign and capacity building will need to be the foci of future projects. The Action Plans indicates that "Producers -- NGOs, community associations, and individuals -- are responsible to implement the Strategy while Government services will focus on planning, monitoring, control, and evaluation.

2. Objectives

Phase One is expected to have significant impact on biodiversity trends and set the stage for long-term improvement of protected area management. Its 5-year Project Development Objective and Global Objectives are combined: to reverse biodiversity trends in priority protected areas.

3. Rationale for Bank's Involvement

GEF assistance to PRONAGEN would supplement other donors' efforts in the realm of biodiversity conservation (ECOPAS, CUSP, ARLY, NAZINGA) and complement the national Community-based Rural Development Program (CBRDP) financed by the Government as well as by IDA and other donors. It not only would finance biodiversity conservation activities above and beyond activities targeted by the CBRDP, but also would help coordinate ongoing activities in the livestock, agriculture, and natural resources management sectors in relation to WCU management. PRONAGEN has the potential to leverage additional funding for biodiversity conservation from other donors (for example, Belgium has already signified their interest in co-financing PRONAGEN). The World Bank has acquired much experience, and is at the forefront of the development of new approaches, with Community-based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM), Community-based Rural Development (CBRDP), and the new generation of Community Action Programs (CAP). There is no question that the Bank has a comparative advantage in this realm (for example, with GEPRENAF; the Environment Management Project (PNGT) in Burkina; Natural Resources Management Project (PGRN) in Benin, Mali, and Niger; and Land Management and Rural Infrastructure Project (PNGTER) in Cote d'Ivoire).

Value-added of GEF Support

By financing the incremental costs of improved biodiversity conservation through upgrading management of priority areas and enhancing natural resources management in the hinterland with more environmentally sound practices, GEF participation in PRONAGEN will enhance the security of global biodiversity assets. GEF financing has the potential to improve management in the short term and increase sustainability of achievements in the longer term by (1) providing alternatives for foregone revenues and financing the incremental cost of improved management practices, (2) broadening participation of local communities in stewardship of wildland, (3) ensuring that communities share in the economic benefits of improved management, and (4) leveraging additional financing from

other donors and the private sector. In the absence of GEF financing, the Government could not shoulder the incremental cost of improving management of WCUs or providing incentives to communities and rural residents to adopt better stewardship practices.

Value-added of the APL instrument

One of the Bank's comparative advantages is its ability to mobilize long-term financing when certain criteria are met. The most important requirement is that the Bank and Government agree on a long-term vision for a sector. This is clearly the case as demonstrated by the Wildlife Sector Reform, Biological Diversity and Action Plan, and Letter of Policy for Decentralized Rural Development. The APL instrument is also justified when an approach defined by a new policy needs to be fine-tuned or "adapted" prior to national extension. While there is an agreement on the program's long-term development goal, there is also a need to adjust ways and means based on implementing experience. Through such instruments, the Bank can also provide leadership for donor coordination under a common strategy developed by the Government of Burkina. Phase I will be used to enhance donor buy-in in biodiversity conservation and harmonize approaches. Finally, institutional capacity needs strengthening over time, but investment cannot wait, because biodiversity degradation is already quite significant in numerous ecosystems. An APL enables implementation of conservation activities while ensuring that national and local capacities and institutions are built at a realistic pace.

4. Description

GEF support to PRONAGEN will be implemented through three components:

Component 1: National capacity building to support decentralized management of protected areas

Component 2: Local capacity building to manage protected areas

Component 3: Program administration and Monitoring

National capacity building to support decentralized management of protected areas

Through this component, the GEF will finance: I. Incremental support to Forestry Department; II. Awareness building and training, including (a) awareness building of forestry staff, concessionaires and private operators, (b) training of National Forestry Department (Direction Générale des Eaux et Forêts, or DGEF) staff, (c) training and awareness raising of private operators, (d) setting up a small documentation center; III. Studies and workshops to support sector reforms, including (a) legal and institutional reforms, (b) national economic and financial analysis of protected areas, (c) long-term financing mechanisms, (d) professionalization of private guides and creation of label for protected area products, (e) national audits of concessionaires; IV. Monitoring, information system, and communication, including (a) national monitoring of bioindicators, (b) national monitoring of protected area encroachment, (c) web gateway; and V. International coordination

Local capacity building to manage protected Areas

Through this component, the GEF will finance: I. Incremental support to (a) local advisory fora around protected areas, (b) Wildlife Conservation Units, (c) provincial services of agriculture, livestock, and education; II. Technical assistance; III. Training and awareness raising, including (a) training for project field staff and partners, (b) community awareness building, (c) community training, (d) local institution building; IV. Local development, including (a) participatory diagnostics and establishment of Local Development Plans in limited number of villages, (b) implementation of Local Development Plans (tallied as baseline but not financed by GEF); V. Initial steps of protected area management, including (a) identification of protected areas, (b) pastoral tenure and users' diagnostic in Sahel; (c) study of conservation

dynamics in Kaboré-Nazinga-Sissili Complex; (d) water resource diagnostic of Mares aux Hippo Biosphere Reserve, (e) preparation of protected areas management plans; VI. Implementation of protected areas management plans, including (a) construction and maintenance of infrastructures, (b) surveillance of protected areas, (c) use of protected areas, (d) local ecosystem monitoring; and VII. Administration of component.

Project administration and monitoring

Through this component, the GEF will finance: I. Incremental support to (a) the National Steering Committee and Scientific and Technical Advisory Council, (b) the Conseil National pour la Gestion de l'Environnement (CONAGESE); II.) Project administration, including (a) procurement, (b) financial management, (c) planning and reporting, (d) implementation monitoring; and III. Audits.

The table below includes both project funds and parallel cofinancing from other donor's projects in support to CBRDP.

1. National capacity building for support to decentralized management of protected areas
2. Local capacity building to manage protected areas
3. Project administration and monitoring

5. Financing

Total	(US\$m)
GOVERNMENT OF BURKINA	1.68
LOCAL COMMUNITIES	0.59
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY	7.50
OTHER SOURCES (UNIDENTIFIED)	3.63
OTHER PRIVATE COMMERCIAL SOURCES (UNIDENTIFIED)	0.06
Total Project Cost	13.46

6. Implementation

Institutional arrangements Oversight (Maitrise d'Ouvrage) - PRONAGEN/FEM will be under the responsibility of the National Wildlife Service (Direction de la Faune et des Chasses) in the National Forestry Department (Direction Générale des Eaux et Forêts) in the Ministry of Environment and Hydraulics.

Steering - A small National Steering Committee (NSC) will monitor implementation of all projects financed under PRONAGEN. The NSC will be chaired by the General Director of the Forestry Department and comprise at most 10 representatives of ministries, donors, and NGOs. It will meet annually to (1) analyze the project results consolidated in annual reports, (2) analyze, discuss, and adopt the annual work programs and strategic plans, and (3) advise the project teams on the conformity of results, annual programs, and strategies with national policies and experiences.

Advising - A Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) will provide overall scientific and technical guidance on all project matters to the PCU of all projects implemented under PRONAGEN. It will be chaired by the General Director of CONAGESE (under the Ministry of Environment) and will comprise conservation specialists and partners from universities, Government, NGOs, donors, and private operators. The STAC members will meet each semester or as requested by any of its members.

Implementation arrangements National Coordination (Maitrise d'Oeuvre) - In Phase 1, for the GEF project and all project implemented under PRONAGEN, the Forestry Department will set up a small Program Coordination Unit (PCU) within its Wildlife Office in Ouagadougou. A National Coordinator will lead the PCU. A monitoring and evaluation specialist, a capacity building specialist, an

experienced financial management specialists and a procurement specialist will assist him/her. The PCU will be responsible for day-to-day implementation of all components of PRONAGEN at the national level, including management of project funds, monitoring and evaluation, national procurement, consolidation of annual reports and work programs, and presentation of progress to the NSC, STAC, and donors. The PCU will directly implement Components 1 (C1 above) and Component 3. The PCU delegates implementation of Component 2 to conservators and concessionaires. Conservators and concessionaires in Wildlife Conservation Units (Maitrise d'Oeuvre Délégée)

Component 2 is implemented in nine protected areas within four Wildlife Conservation Units. Not all Wildlife Conservation Units, and protected areas within them, start PRONAGEN's Phase 1 with the same level of maturity or will follow the exact same scenario during implementation. Consequently, implementation arrangements are variable from WCU to WCU. Nevertheless, in all WCUs, a conservator is entrusted with (1) monitoring all project activities pertaining to the overall unit, (2) relations and supervision with other Government services operating under protocol with the WCUS including anti-poaching teams, and (3) providing advice, support, and supervision to concessionaires. By program's end, concessionaires will ensure day-to-day management of all protected areas. However, during Phase 1, only Comoé-Léraba and Kaboré Tambi will be managed by a concessionaire. For other protected areas targeted by GEF funds, the community has not yet been organized to be concessionaire. In such cases, the conservator carries out all activities under Component 2, from (1) creating and building capacity of an AGEREF-to-be-concessionaire to (2) activities that are normally under the responsibility of concessionaires such as surveillance, initiating and supervising studies, preparation of management plans, organization of ecological monitoring, and initial implementation of management plans. The detailed set-up for each WCU is provided below:

Sahel Wildlife Conservation Unit: Because, there is no concessionaire in the Sahel unit, its conservator is entirely in charge of implementation of all Component 2 activities. That unit comprises the northern part of the huge Sahel Partial Reserve. It is sparsely inhabited, and no true protected area exists today. There, the conservator will need to work with communities to negotiate and delineate new protected areas. Several sites are already identified: Nassoumbou; Séno Mango; Beli; Oursi; and Darkoye. Thereafter, for each of these new protected areas, the conservator will create and strengthen an AGEREF until it can become concessionaire and recruit its guides. In the Sahel, this is not expected to occur before Phase 2. Because of the dimension and complexity of the Sahel unit, its conservator will enlist assistance from three specialists (one conservation, one sociologist, and one livestock), one accountant, and six facilitators.

Bobo Wildlife Conservation Unit: Because there is no concessionaire in the Bobo unit, its conservator is entirely in charge of implementation of all Component 2 activities. The Bobo WCU possesses three protected areas. The project targets one of the three: the Mare aux Hippo Biosphere Reserve. There, the conservator will create and strengthen an AGEREF until it can become concessionaire and recruit its guide. To implement Component 2, the conservator will recruit one conservation specialist, one accountant, and one facilitator.

PONASI Wildlife Conservation Unit: Only one protected area in the PONASI unit is targeted by GEF funds: The Kaboré Tambi National Park. This park is conceded to a local NGO called NATURAMA. In coordination with the conservator, NATURAMA's staff will implement Component 2 in Kaboré Tambi National Park through a sole-source, results-based contract. It will follow the steps leading to the creation and strengthening of an AGEREF as well as carry out day-to-day management of the park. When the new AGEREF has adequate capacity, NATURAMA will hand over its concession rights over the Kaboré Tambi National Park, expected to occur during

Phase 2. The conservator will recruit an accountant and two facilitators while NATURAMA will set up a team of three specialists (one conservation, one sociologist, one gender sp.), one accountant, and 9 facilitators.

Comoé Wildlife Conservation Unit: GEF financing targets the two protected areas of the Comoé unit: the Comoé-Léraba Reserve and the Boulon-Koflandé Forest. The Comoé-Léraba Reserve is already conceded to an AGEREF. As concessionaire, the AGEREF will implement all activities under Component 2 (basically, implementation of the management plan) within its concession through a sole-source, results-based contract. The AGEREF will staff up with a manager and an accountant. The Boulon-Koflandé Forest is not conceded. There, the conservator of the Comoé unit and its team will implement Component 2 throughout Phase 1. He/she will follow the process of creation and strengthening of an AGEREF until it can become concessionaire of Boulon-Koflandé and recruit its own guide. The conservator will recruit a conservation specialist, an accountant, and three facilitators.

Operational Manuals

Three manuals will facilitate and guide implementation of: (1) implementation plan, (2) administrative and financial procedures,, and (3) monitoring and evaluation. The Project Implementation Plan (Document de Projet) describes the details of project execution. It also provides the terms of reference (TORs) and draft contracts or protocols for all project staff, partner services, projects, or institutions. The administrative manual lays out the accounting, internal controls, audit, and disbursements arrangements, and the personnel policy and procedures. It provides the TORs for the auditors and administrative or accounting members of the project teams. A monitoring and evaluation manual lays out the system required to link financial disbursement to implementation to impact. The system builds on the Community-based Natural Resources and Wildlife Management Project (GEPRENAF's) current indicators and is similar to that of CBRDP.

Arrangements for APL Phase 2 and Phase 3 approval Assessment of this APL program will be based on GEF's usual standards, with each tranche viewed as separate but interlinked projects. Approvals for continuing GEF support of this APL are proposed to be based on a delegated authority to the GEF CEO, and would be based on four ingredients:(1) Approval of tranche releases would be based on the project meeting minimum benchmark accomplishments and trigger points described in the Project Brief and in detail in the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) developed for each tranche. (2) GEF approvals would parallel the APL rolling review process used by the WB. Based on the PAD approved by the WB Regional Vice President for proceeding to the next tranche of the APL, the WB would request GEF CEO approval for GEF financing. (3) On the basis of this information, the GEF CEO would confirm the adequacy of accomplishments of the previous tranche and approve release of the next tranche. The CEO and Secretariat could request clarification of performance indicators if required. (4) The GEF CEO would provide an information document to Council based on these three elements, indicating to Council that program performance fell within acceptable margins and conformed with minimum indicators expressed (for that tranche), signaling CEO approval of the next tranche. If minimum objectives were not met, tranche release could be delayed. If there were significant deviations from the original agreed targets, Council would be invited to review the relevant PAD to offer its views on the change in circumstances before CEO endorsement. If the CEO believed that insufficient information was available, or if significant changes in targets or triggers were required, the CEO could provide requested advice and/or approval from Council and revert to its guidance.

7. Sustainability

Sustainability is linked to the ability of the APL to provide incentives at all levels to improve (1) local communities and Government commitment to reforms,

(2) optimization of revenues to balance conservation costs; (3) professionalism and ethics of private operators, and (4) cost-effectiveness, quality, and innovation of proposed activities and investments. Setting the stage for such a combination takes time, hence the 15-year multi-phase programmatic approach. Additionally, sustainability will also depend on the capacity of the project not to burden the Government's budget with additional needs. To this effect, technical assistance and financing of recurrent costs will be phased out gradually.

Government commitment

Government's early commitment to sustain policy reforms and assist community implementation of management plans as well as to staffing and funding of the project is critical. Government commitment has been demonstrated through GEPRENAF implementation as well as implementation of similar projects/programs (see also D4, indication of Borrower's commitment). Nevertheless, to diminish the risk associated with potential Government changes or appointments, PRONAGEN/FEM's early conditions and subsequent triggers were designed to ensure that declared commitment is followed up by actions that demonstrate it.

The success of PRONAGEN to restore degraded habitat and policy changes to improve range, water, and wildlife resources management efficiency are inextricably linked with the sustainability of biodiversity protection measures. To this end, Government's commitment to sustainable natural resources use (1) enabling revenue capture by the rural communities and (2) improving both the knowledge base and field capacity for effective stewardship of biodiversity resources is encouraging and should contribute significantly to the sustainability of the project results. To this effect, GEF and other donors' financing will help the Ministry of Environment improve the national legal and institutional frameworks for protected area management.

Financial sustainability

By the end of the current implementation period (mid-2002), it is not expected that GEPRENAF results in Diéfoula-Logoniégué will be fully sustainable (see also independent evaluation in Annex 13). This expectation is despite a successful implementation and a better wildlife potential than initially expected. A model was prepared that shows that five more years of less intense financing should be sufficient to demonstrate the validity of the approach and reach financial sustainability. By 2006, it is expected that revenues will exceed management costs. At other sites, income from biodiversity management will originate from ecotourism and small game hunting. These areas are already registered with tour operators and receive tourists. While these activities will rapidly provide some return, they are unlikely to balance spending in the short term. All three phases will be required to come close to financial sustainability.

Additional sources of long-term financing, such as the creation of a trust or a foundation, will be sought throughout the APL. The objective is to ensure that negative financial gaps are secured and resources are channeled to local development funds by the end of the Program.

Private sector involvement

In Phase 1, PRONAGEN/FEM will seek to define a better equilibrium between the private sector and other partners. To achieve this, it will identify hurdles that, in the past, have led to non-professional, unethical guides staying in the sector while keeping away investors more interested in long-term involvement and sustainable use. Identified constraints range from the lack of an adequate tax system, difficulty in securing investments, lack of adequate governance both during selection and operation, to lack of enforcement of contract items, and political intervention. By the end of Phase 2, it is expected that each protected area will be equipped with ethical and professional private guides with secured long-term licenses/agreements with the concessionaire AGEREFs.

Technical assistance

The GEPRENAF independent evaluation pointed out the success of the technical assistance component and recommended pursuing it for an additional phase while decreasing its costs. The main culprit of the model is the low initial capacity of rural villagers to take over the complex management of a protected area. To palliate this, small teams of national experts must provide assistance for project implementation, innovation, community-approach, and transfer of skills. Also, because the success of PRONAGEN depends on such innovation and on the effective adoption by communities of alternative behaviors, it is important that such assistance be available until all fundamental evolution occurs and until the AGEREFs have the capacity to fully assume their role of concessionaires. Technical assistants are the builders of a model that is designed to function without their input. By working with communities, Government services and private guides are also there to catalyze neutral solutions that best fit the interests of all three partners. At a given site, their intervention is required for 10 to 15 years depending on its complexity. The costs of technical assistance are kept to a minimum by working exclusively with national staff, by drawing all-inclusive contracts with firms or NGOs whereby they provide services and operation costs, and, when possible, by giving preference to direct contracting over contracting of firms.

Financing of recurrent costs

In Phase 1, the project will co-finance part of Government services recurrent costs (5.7% of total costs). This practice is common in Burkina because Government revenues are not sufficient to allocate adequate budget to conservation. Nonetheless, the level is below the Government "after-tax" counterpart funding of 10%. Counterpart funding for operation costs is set at 35% to provide adequate incentive for rational use of operation funds. The project will seek to minimize the role of Government services, secure more stable budget allocation from the Government, and contractualize some of the services that foresters only can carry out (for example, antipoaching). Such support will be gradually phased out in Phase 2 and disappear in Phase 3.

Other incentives

Financial sustainability is only one aspect of sustainability and may not always be the most relevant to the local communities. In GEPRENAF, it seems that the communities are even more appreciative of other externalities such as inter-community relationships, restoration of traditional land use rights and values, community outreach, and maintenance of a natural "patrimony.

Finally, sustainability depends on the perception, by the communities at large, of PRONAGEN's benefits to their daily lives, social comfort, and capacity to produce. The CBRDP aims to alleviate these concerns and decentralized much decision-making and financing of community priorities. In addition, improved awareness of natural resources degradation and adoption of alternative behaviors, rules, and technologies may prove sufficient to sustainably diminish pressure on the natural ecosystem. SILEM intervention will be of additional help to secure such alternative production systems.

8. Lessons learned from past operations in the country/sector

ENV and QAG review of GEF-supported biodiversity projects in Africa

Several reviews have been consulted: 1998 QAG review of the Natural Resources Management Portfolio; 1997 QAG review of biodiversity projects in Africa; and 1998 ENV Bank-wide review of biodiversity projects. As a general rule, these reviews call for better upstream design, strong commitment and capacity by Government and other stakeholders, mainstreaming in the country portfolio, setting up realistic and consensual development objectives, coordination with NGOs and others, as well as more intense than normal Bank supervision. All of these features were considered in PRONAGEN's design.

An apparently more recent QAG diagnostic of a sample of GEF-supported projects (quoted from GEF Tunisia Park PCD) is "that future projects must possess the following features: (1) integrating the biodiversity conservation agenda into the broader national development agenda is essential; (2) biodiversity projects need to focus more on methods for dealing with socioeconomic pressure in perimeter zones in which populations may be dependent on forest utilization; (3) project design should take into account technical and stakeholders' reviews of the final design; and (4) clearly defined goals and objectives are essential to focus on project efforts, monitor progress, and demonstrate impact." The project follows all four operational recommendations. On a broad level, the QAG recommends inclusion of more environmental expertise in developing the CAS. In Burkina Faso, the recently completed PRSP and CAS benefited from input from the Environment Department. The project contributes to the natural resources and rural development agenda of the PRSP and CAS.

Community-Driven Development

In many countries, limited government success in managing natural resources, providing basic infrastructure, and ensuring primary social services has led to the search for alternative options. One of these options is participatory community-driven development (CDD). The substantial experience accumulated to date of what works and does not work has been drawn on in designing the project. In particular, for the government and outsiders to induce community-driven development on a large scale requires agencies to invest in local organizational capacity and support community control in decision-making. In addition, experience shows that community-driven development does not automatically include marginalized groups, the poor, women, and ethnic minorities unless their inclusion is specifically highlighted as a goal at the agency and community level. Finally, successful community-driven development is characterized by five main factors: local organizational capacity or the existence of viable community groups, the appropriate fit of technology to community capacity, effective outreach strategies, client responsive agencies, and enabling higher government policies and commitment. All these factors are built into PRONAGEN/FEM's design.

The interface with the livestock sector is one of the most important dimensions of the project. The experience of the West Africa Pilot Pastoral Perimeters Program (WAPPP), particularly in Chad and Senegal, shows that proper use of rangeland, with rules set up by the community on spatial and temporal bases, can improve rangeland and the relationship among pastoralists, farmers, and traders. WAPPP's holistic approach will be taught to project teams to ensure that their analysis of the production and conservation systems focuses on the causes of degradation rather than the symptoms.

Arid land ecology

Lessons from northern Africa (Morocco, Tunisia) indicate that, within an arid ecosystem, a 100,000-ha protected area can be adequate for proper conservation of most large arid land mammals. Northern Africa projects also show that, even with rainfall less than 150 mm/year, significant habitat restoration can be spectacular and lead to not only habitat recovery but also the reappearance of locally extinct species. Similar lessons are drawn in the Sudanian domain, where improved protection can lead to spectacular vegetation and wildlife recovery (Nazinga game ranch in the 1980s). Results and lessons from the Burkina GEF Pilot (GEPRENAF)

Since May 1996, community-driven development has been tested with its full biodiversity conservation dimension in the Comoé ecosystem. The Diéfoula-Logoniégué area has received financial assistance from the GEF/Belgium through the Pilot Community-based Natural Resources and Wildlife Management Project (GEPRENAF). Seventeen villages have created their CVGTs (Comité Villageois de Gestion des Terroirs) and federated them in an AGEREF (Association Intervillageoise de Gestion des Ressources Naturelles et de la Faune). They have allocated 100,000 ha to biodiversity conservation and drafted a management plan.

The Government has legally recognized the AGEREF (as an association) and is in the process of granting it concession over the gazetted forest. Commercial activities (safari hunting) have recently started on a test basis. All villages have set up their Village Investment Funds (VIF) and the AGEREF co-manages a Conservation Fund with the project coordination unit. GEPRENAF financed, or leveraged financing for, a number of social infrastructures, wells, rural roads as well as activities ranging from training, agriculture/livestock conflict management, agricultural research and intensification, soil conservation, to microcredit and literacy.

An independent evaluation of GEPRENAF recognized the important achievement of GEPRENAF in local development and empowerment of local communities as well as building the foundations for adequate community-based conservation (see full summary in Annex 13). The evaluation considers ecological achievement as limited (in term of wildlife recovery) but stressed that such recovery can result only from long-term commitment. It recommends (1) pursuing and expanding the scope of GEPRENAF to include nearby Koflandé but maintaining a similar level of technical assistance; (2) focusing future financing on management of the "protected area"; (3) limiting the institutional responsibility of the AGEREF to "concessionaire" of the gazetted forest but clarifying the role of the local forestry department; and (4) diversifying sources of revenues by tackling the full range of wildland potential benefits. The recommendations of the independent evaluation are worked into the design of PRONAGEN.

Other lessons learnt from GEPRENAF were incorporated into the design on PRONAGEN/FEM. The experience with the GEPRENAF showed that there were too high expectations of community capacity to manage protection areas. Therefore, with PRONAGEN/FEM, management by private sector operators is being promoted. Furthermore, the GEPRENAF was spread across too many activities including wildlife management, local development, agriculture intensification, etc. PRONAGEN does not cover local development activities that are being covered by the CBRDP. The project is concentrating on management of protected areas and on capacity building for biodiversity conservation. It therefore acts as a sort of add-on to the CBRDP and thus allows for complementarity of activities.

Other lesson from Burkina

Additional lessons were learned through other donors' implementation of projects under the wildlife reform. GEPRENAF differentiated the role of "concessionaire" from that of "guide"; it had exceptionally requested that the concessionaire be an inter-village community association: the AGEREF. The AGEREF, in turn, was to recruit a private firm/individual to fill the guide's role. France used a Conservation Unit Support Project (CUSP) to pilot a mainstream interpretation of the reform. The CUSP financed a system in which private firms are recruited through a competitive bidding process ensure both roles. Communities are then mobilized through a parallel local development project and through sharing improved conservation benefits. Unfortunately, the lack of professional standards and effective control as well as the low short-term profitability of protected areas provided insufficient incentive for any of the actors to respect the rules of the reform.

9. Program of Targeted Intervention (PTI) N

10. Environment Aspects (including any public consultation)

Issues : PRONAGEN/FEM is a biodiversity conservation project whose benefits on the environment are expected to be largely positive. Some risks are associated with the implementation of works in and around protected areas (wells, tracks, firebreaks). Social issues have the potential to appear should a

portion of the communities set conservation rules that exclude another portion from accessing previously used hunting grounds or agricultural or grazing land.

Two national consultants (an ecologist and a sociologist) carried out the EA which was then consolidated by an international consultant. All traveled throughout the WCUs, visited some of the communities, had access to all project files and data, and met regularly with the Comité Technique de Suivi de la Préparation du Projet (CTSP). The assessment proceeded in close parallel with project preparation, so that findings are incorporated in overall project design, including support for strengthening capacity of the PRONAGEN teams to monitor, evaluate, and mitigate environmental impacts of activities.

The final assessment is available at Infoshop. In country, the final EA has been disclosed at all project sites, through the relevant existing fora, and in Ouagadougou distributed to CTSP and its availability published in local newspapers.

11. Contact Point:

Task Manager
Jean-Michel G. Pavy
The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington D.C. 20433
Telephone: (225) 22 400 421
(at the Abidjan Office in Cote
d'Ivoire); DAMA 331 421
Fax: (225) 22 44 79 79
email: jpavy@worldbank.org

12. For information on other project related documents contact:

The InfoShop
The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 458-5454
Fax: (202) 522-1500
Web: [http:// www.worldbank.org/infoshop](http://www.worldbank.org/infoshop)

Note: This is information on an evolving project. Certain components may not be necessarily included in the final project.

This PID was processed by the InfoShop during the week ending Jan. 18, 2001.