

**Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Readiness Mechanism
Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) External Review Template**
(interim, January 12, 2011, from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5)

Guidelines for Reviewers:

- 1) FCPF REDD Country Participant R-PPs will be reviewed and assessed by the FCPF Participants Committee, the FCPF's governing body, taking TAP comments into account. External (Technical Advisory Panel or other) and Bank reviewers may provide recommendations on how a draft R-PP could be enhanced, using this template on a pilot basis until a process is approved by the PC.
- 2) One set of criteria should be used for review: specific standards each of the current 6 components of an R-PP should be met.
- 3) Your comments will be merged with other reviewer comments (without individual attribution) into a synthesis document that will be made public, in general, so bear this in mind when commenting.
- 4) Please provide thoughtful, fair assessment of the draft R-PP, in the form of actionable recommendations for the potential enhancement of the R-PP by the submitting country. A REDD Country Participant would be allowed three submissions of an R-PP to the PC for consideration.

Objectives of a Readiness Preparation Proposal (condensed directly from Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 3)

The purpose of the R-PP is to build and elaborate on the previous Readiness Plan Idea Note (R-PIN) or a country's relevant comparable work, to assist a country in laying out and organizing the steps needed to achieve 'Readiness' to undertake activities to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), in the specific country context. The R-PP provides a framework for a country to set a clear roadmap, budget, and schedule to achieve REDD Readiness. The FCPF does not expect that the activities identified in the R-PP and its Terms of Reference (ToR) would actually occur at the R-PP stage, although countries may decide to begin pilot activities for which they have capacity and stakeholder support. Instead, the R-PP consists of a summary of the current policy and governance context, what study and other preparatory activities would occur under each major R-PP component, how they would be undertaken in the R-PP execution phase, and then a ToR or work plan for each component. The activities would generally be performed in the next, R-PP execution phase, not as part of the R-PP formulation process.

Review of R-PP of (fill in country name): Burkina Faso

Reviewer: Consolidated TAP Review of 7 reviewers by Juergen Blaser and Saeed Abdul-Razak

Date of review (of Draft R-PP): 5th May 2012

Date of 2nd review (of revised Draft R-PP): 12 June 2012

Note: Blue text refers to original assessment of the R-PP (April 2012), and the red text refers to revised assessment of the revised R-PP (June, 2012)

Standards to be Met by R-PP Components

(From Program Document FMT 2009-1, Rev. 5)

Assessment summary (originally written in May, 2012, but updated after the revised R-PP in June, 2012):

Burkina Faso submitted its first draft R-PP in mid-April, 2012 for informal consideration at PC 12 (June 2012).

A TAP Team consisting of 7 members reviewed the draft R-PP in the second half of April 2012. A revised version was then submitted to TAP on June 6, 2012. The present report includes the first assessment of the TAP and the assessment of the revised draft R-PP (highlighted in red).

The main natural habitats of Burkina Faso – semi-arid forest, woodland and savannah - are the most widely distributed natural habitat type in between the tropics, covering more than 40% of the entire tropical landscape. While semi-arid forests typically have lower biomass densities and thus lower carbon stocks than humid forests, their extensive coverage makes them a significant terrestrial carbon store of global importance. Burkina Faso has a tradition of community forestry and protected areas that can be built on for REDD readiness, and it has good on-going support from several countries, including through the Forest Investment Program. It has evolving technical capacity for dealing with broader land use issues. The R-PP shows good knowledge and understanding of the drivers for deforestation and forest degradation.

The document is well written, and there is a very useful detailed executive summary at the beginning as well as a set of helpful annexes. Also, much of the infrastructure and policy development that is proposed here will also be important for meeting the needs identified in the 2011 WB report on Vulnerability, Risk Reduction, and Adaptation to Climate Change for Burkina Faso. The document is based on a number of prior assessments undertaken in the framework of the preparation of the Forest Investment Programme (FIP). It is important that the RPP clearly refers to the FIP in the various sections. A statement in the beginning of the RPP could also further clarify on the complementarity between the RPP and the FIP.

While good assessments have been done in the RPP on the various aspects of land-use management, the good understanding of drivers has not yet been taken fully over into the detailed planning necessary to meet the standard for final approval of the R-PP, in particular in respect to the REDD+ strategy and the linked section on reference level and MRV. An important overall point is made in the preface that because funding is available from other sources to begin the REDD+ preparation process, this document is a "plan" rather than a "proposal." Nonetheless, to fulfill the role of a plan, clearer work programs containing for each main activity, information on the main tasks and institutions responsible for delivery need to be added under the main components. The document as it stands now could be better described as a general plan for a work plan that need some more details required to show exactly how the program will get to implementation.

Overall recommendations:

The TAP has made some detailed recommendations under each component of the RPP, including:

- 1) In general terms: the plan is well elaborated and presented, however, many of the interesting figures and maps are not clearly presented or just unreadable. It is important that the revised version is well presented so that illustrations provided in the R-PP can be of use. Also, there is a need to carefully revise the English version of the R-PP (as it does not correspond in many parts to the original version in French and is much less comprehensible due to insufficient translation). → This recommendation has sufficiently been addressed in the revised R-PP.
- 2) There is a need to be more precise under each component by adding clear work plans that also indicate the institutions responsible for a particular outcome (e.g. governmental institutions, scientific institutions, civil society or outside consultants) → partly addressed in the revised R-PP.
- 3) Complement information on the National Readiness Management Arrangements as proposed in the specific recommendations → also addressed to satisfaction in the revised R-PP.
- 4) Extend the information and early consultation processes to a broader number of stakeholders in an early stage of RPP implementation. Propose an activity to consult on the consultation and participation process and develop proper approaches to deal with conflicts → also addressed in the revised R-PP.

- 5) Complete the analysis of deforestation and forest degradation drivers by those elements that are of direct link to the proposed pillars of the REDD+ strategy, in particular problems at the level of land-use planning, land tenure security and measures at the level of classification of forest land. Justify better the four strategic pillars of the REDD+ strategy and give more precision on the REDD+ strategic options, e.g. by adding a work plan with the main activities and defined institutions responsible for them → this has been addressed to some extent in the revised R-PP., further work will be needed in the process of R-PP implementation
- 6) Complement needed information for the development of the reference level, add work plans and assign clear responsibilities. Revise the rather generic assumptions in respect to the carbon objectives → In the view of the TAP, this part has not been sufficiently addressed in the revised R-PP.
- 7) Reflect on capacity building activities and support institutional strengthening in the preparation and implementation of the proposed REDD+ strategies, reference level development and MRV → some notion of capacity building has been added, but this part could be strengthened.
- 8) Complement the work proposed under multiple benefits and integrate these elements in the MRV system → at least some more precision, based on the TAP's recommendations could be given here.
- 9) Review the budget lines under some of the components, e.g. review excessive budget for consultations (US\$ 2.4 m), reconsider the budgeting for the recruitment of a study firm for AT at CN-REDD. → The budget lines have been explained. As the R-PP is part of the larger REDD+ development in Burkina Faso, including the R-PP and the two projects of the Forest Investment Programme, the budget items under 1a and 1c are justified under the consideration that they serve the larger process.

Overall TAP comments on the Revised R-PP (June 2012)

The already well elaborated first draft of the R-PP has been further improved, particularly in section 1 and 2. Clarification has been given on how the R-PP is linked to the Forest Investment Program (FIP) and the two projects that are proposed within the FIP (one supported by the World Bank and the other supported by the African Development Bank). The TAP understands now better the functional relationship between the Readiness Preparation Plan, as proposed here, and the implementation of the FIP projects, undertaken partly in parallel, partly subsequently to the implementation of the R-PP. It is important to underline this functional link between the R-PP and the FIP, as some of the elements, in particular in respect to organizations and consultation, REDD+ strategy, and REDD+ implementation are somewhat different from R-PP submissions of other countries.

Considering that the R-PP is an integral part of such a wider process, the TAP understands the R-PP as containing essentially the preparation phase of the REDD+ Strategy (including organizational and consultation elements, analytical studies and capacity building). In this context it is important to underline that no additional structures are created for concertation and consultation. Also, the TAP noted that the preparation of the REDD+ strategy is supported by an important external support ("consulting office"), however, it also noted that once the REDD+ strategy is validated, this support unit will disappear and implementation of REDD+ will be by existing structures and programmes.

In summary, the TAP concluded that while there is a need for improvement, mainly in Section 3 and 4, the quality of the present document is good. Also, the initial choice of REDD+ strategic options is pertinent in the context of the country. The basis is laid out for the development of a validated REDD+ strategy as main outcome of the R-PP process. The TAP expects however that some of its observations and recommendations made in those sections that are assessed as "partially met" will still be addressed by the proponents. The TAP assessment of the standards for each section is summarized in the table below.

Assessment Table:

Sections	R-PP April 2012-Submission	Revised R-PP Early June 2012-Submission
1a	Partially met	Met
1b	Largely met	Largely met
1c	Partially met	Partially met
2a	Largely met	Met
2b	Partially met	Largely met
2c	Partially met	Partially met
2d	Largely met	Largely met
3	Partially met	Partially met
4a	Partially met	Partially met
4b	Not met	Partially met
5	Partially met	Largely met
6	Partially met	Largely met

-end general section-

Component 1. Organize and Consult

Standard 1a: National Readiness Management Arrangements:

The cross-cutting nature of the design and workings of the national readiness management arrangements on REDD, in terms of including relevant stakeholders and key government agencies beyond the forestry department, commitment of other sectors in planning and implementation of REDD readiness. Capacity building activities are included in the work plan for each component where significant external technical expertise has been used in the R-PP development process.

TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard (May, 2012; not final TAP comments):

Overall, the institutions which are likely to play key roles in REDD + are clearly described and they seem suited to oversee the implementation of the RPP, including (i) A National Coordination Committee; (ii) Local and Regional Committees for consultation; and (iii) A National Consensus Platform. It is clearly stated in the document that in the process of preparation of REDD+ all relevant institutions and stakeholders are involved. However, as Burkina Faso has adopted a national gender policy in 2008, it is important that corresponding institutions (governmental and non-governmental) are also formally represented in all structures that are related to REDD+. Also, the tasks and responsibilities of the National Committee are clearly formulated. The consultation bodies (*organes de concertation*) are well described and the TAP noted that a governmental degree has been prepared to this effect (Annex 1a).

The TAP also noted that although some specific structures are created for REDD+ readiness and implementation, the country does not create complete new permanent structures for REDD+. In this context, it is important that the RPP includes an assessment of capacity needs for REDD+ so that existing structures and platforms are effectively re-enforced and valorized. It is also important to clearly clarify the particular responsibility, the lines of authority and reporting of the newly created bodies (REDD National Committee, REDD Focal Point, National Coordination/Technical Secretariat) that are described in Figure 1.

Some specific observations in respect to the various committee created include: (i) Communal REDD Committees can be engaged beyond identifying "actions that people wish to implement in the context of

REDD” as stated in the document. E.g. consultations on issues such as examining drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, land-use and governance issues etc could also be considered to be debated in such committees. (ii) Although the role of the CC-REDD Committee to explain the objectives of REDD to the people is laudable, it is also important to take the concerns and views of the people into account and address them to improve the REDD process. This needs to be better recognized. (iii) As part of the responsibilities of the CC-REDD Committee, it would “identify and propose solutions to mitigate” impacts of CC. The bullet (4th in line) should rather read “...solutions to adapt to these impacts”. The R-PP makes a good point in preparing an account of traditional knowledge in favor of REDD+. Thus, the R-PP also needs to recognize the need to take into account existing traditional knowledge and community actions in the solutions to adapt to climate change generally. (v) With respect to the responsibilities of the National Consultation Platform REDD, bullet 1 in the R-PP might need to be re-phrased. The Platform is a consultation platform meaning that issues are deliberated upon in order to receive various stakeholder views. The Platform main role is thus not to support/endorse decisions of the National Committee for REDD as insinuated by bullet 1.

Recommendations:

Overall, the TAP concludes that there has been a sensible process for establishing the necessary systems to manage the REDD+ program. The TAP recommends to carefully reviewing the timing for the process (that seems to be probably underestimated) as well as the lines of responsibilities and reporting of the various bodies created. Also, although capacity building activities are mentioned in the discussion for each component of the R-PP, there is not much detail provided in the national readiness management arrangements. In the TAP’s view, this is an important element that needs more attention. In addition, the following more detailed recommendations should be taken into consideration:

- Reflect on the participation of the Ministry for the Promotion of Women (Ministère de la Promotion de la Femme) and of women’s organizations in all bodies related to REDD+ in a formal manner.
- Clarify in Figure 1 on the Organizational Design of REDD Burkina Faso what is meant by “Government”- for instance, is it used to refer to Parliament, the President’s office, or other?
- Reflect on the composition of the national REDD-Committee: specify the “13 members of national institutions in REDD”. Consider increasing the number of civil society representatives to better represent the great variety of civil society stakeholders active in the sector (including women organizations).
- The RPP intends to “reinforce” commune committees and regional committees in the context of decentralization. Clarify in what form is this reinforcement going to be carried out (financial resources, leadership, etc)
- Clearly name the various national institutions involved in REDD+ National Committee and also in those involved in the various consultation platforms (regional and national). At least this list should be in an annex. (Those of the Civil Society, Private Sector and Financial/technical partners can be specified once they have been identified).
- Add to the list on page 19 of tasks for the technical secretariat the process of maintaining transparency throughout the process of readiness.

Revised R-PP- Comments by the TAP (June, 2012; final TAP comments):

The recommendations made by the TAP have been suitably addressed in general terms, although in some sections, the TAP still requires some more precision and information. The nature of the national readiness management arrangements on REDD+ have been well outlined, in terms of including the relevant stakeholders and key government agencies beyond the forestry department as well as the commitments of other sectors in planning and implementation of REDD readiness. Capacity building activities are partially included at the level of the national platform for REDD+. In the revised document clarifications have been given on the organizational arrangements. The arrangements as outlined in the

present R-PP are meant for the implementation of the R-PP and the two projects of FIP. This justifies the important budget item for the creation and functioning of the CN-REDD, including the use of external expertise (“bureau d’étude”). However, the TAP recommends that the TORs of the consultants (well specified in Annex 1B) should also include some tasks of capacity building and knowledge sharing. In respect to the national coordination platform the proponents might reflect on inviting as a new member of the group of PTFs also FAO and Swiss Cooperation (DDC) as FAO and DDC/SDC have recently signed an agreement to implement a multi-million US\$ project on the promotion of NTFPs in Burkina Faso.

Conclusions:

- ➔ April 2012: Standard 1a partially met.
- ➔ Early June 2012: Standard 1a met.

Standard 1b: Information Sharing and Early Dialogue with Key Stakeholder Groups:

The R-PP presents evidence of the government having undertaken an exercise to identify key stakeholders for REDD-plus, and commenced a credible national-scale information sharing and awareness raising campaign for key relevant stakeholders. The campaign's major objective is to establish an early dialogue on the REDD-plus concept and R-PP development process that sets the stage for the later consultation process during the implementation of the R-PP work plan. This effort needs to reach out, to the extent feasible at this stage, to networks and representatives of forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers and forest dependent communities, both at national and local level. The R-PP contains evidence that a reasonably broad range of key stakeholders has been identified, voices of vulnerable groups are beginning to be heard, and that a reasonable amount of time and effort has been invested to raise general awareness of the basic concepts and process of REDD-plus including the SESA.

TAP’s assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard (May, 2012; not final TAP comments):

There has clearly been an attempt to organize a broad-ranging consultation on REDD+ through the FIP preparation process, and the list provided in the annex (annex 1b, pp. 136-138) documents this. However, the TAP also observes that there was predominance in the consultation process of addressing governmental representatives; important stakeholders, including in particular local authorities (*autorités coutumières et religieuses, représentants des collectivités territoriales*) seem not to have been included sufficiently in the early dialog processes. Also, the TAP noted that legal policy makers (e.g. members of parliament) have not been included in the early information process.

The list in Annex 1b is incomplete in respect to civil society organizations, such as women’s and youth’s associations, forest and rangeland user associations and other local organizations (*associations de femmes et de jeunes, représentants des groupements de gestion forestière, organisations pastorales, des représentants des populations riveraines*). In respect to the private sector, besides those included in the Shea round table (*Table Filière Karité*), no other industry representation seems to have been included in the early consultation process (e.g. *la Dynamisation des filières agro-alimentaires du Burkina (DYFAB), la Fédération des Industries Agro-alimentaires du Burkina (FIAB), l’Association des Importateurs et Exportateurs des Produits Oléagineux (AIEPO)*).

In general terms, the TAP is not clear how the information from the initial consultations has been incorporated into the RPP planning. Also, the TP would need to have some more clarity on the issues that had been discussed in the early stages and of concerns that arose from the consultations.

Recommendations:

In conducting the further information sharing and consultation and participation process (see 1c), the TAP

recommends:

- Broaden the information and early information sharing process with those stakeholders from civil society and private sector that have not been included in the RPP information process as far. This could be done through specific early actions in the **subsequent** RPP consultation process.
- Clarify in the document that information sharing will still be needed during the entire implementation and reporting on REDD+ (it seems to be implied in the work of the Permanent Commission for Sustainable Development but it needs to be more explicit).

Revised R-PP- Comments by the TAP (June, 2012; final TAP comments):

Some more clarification has been given on the information sharing process that preceded the elaboration of the RPP. As the RPP is an integrative part of the FIP, the early information sharing and consultation process was organized in the framework of the FIP preparation. As today there is some more clarity on the extent and nature of interested stakeholders, it is important that the process of implementing the R-PP comprises a continuous information exchange as recommended above.

Conclusions:

→ April 2012 and **early June 2012: Standard 1b largely met.**

Standard 1c: Consultation and Participation Process

Ownership, transparency, and dissemination of the R-PP by the government and relevant stakeholders, and inclusiveness of effective and informed consultation and participation by relevant stakeholders, will be assessed by whether proposals and/ or documentation on the following are included in the R-PP (i) the consultation and participation process for R-PP development thus far³ (ii) the extent of ownership within government and national stakeholder community; (iii) the Consultation and Participation Plan for the R-PP implementation phase (iv) concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders, and a process for their consideration, and/or expressions of their support for the R-PP; (v) and mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD-plus process, and for conflict resolution and redress of grievances.

TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard (May, 2012; not final TAP comments):

The R-PP clearly demonstrates the intention to make consultation and participation as a major practice in the REDD process: It is very important that the design of the consultation has been based on commune/community level consultations with farmers and broader rangeland users, including marginalized groups. It is evident that Burkina Faso through its many years of civil society and community involvement and the extended knowledge available on social-cultural and socio-economic issues relating to forest and rangeland management can capitalize on such experience for the implementation of the RPP/FIP.

However, there is no clear information in the current draft RPP on the objectives and contents of

³ Did the R-PP development, in particular the development of the ToR for the strategic environmental and social assessment and the Consultation and Participation Plan, include civil society, including forest dwellers and Indigenous Peoples representation? In this context the representative(s) will be determined in one of the following ways: (i) self-determined representative(s) meeting the following requirements: (a) selected through a participatory, consultative process; (b) having national coverage or networks; (c) previous experience working with the Government and UN system; (d) demonstrated experience serving as a representative, receiving input from, consulting with, and providing feedback to, a wide scope of civil society including Indigenous Peoples organizations; or (ii) Individual(s) recognized as legitimate representative(s) of a national network of civil society and/or Indigenous Peoples organizations (e.g., the GEF Small Grants National Steering Committee or National Forest Program Steering Committee).

consultations at the various levels, in particular with those stakeholders directly concerned at local levels. It seems that the main architecture of consultation is based on village forums (*fora villageois*). However, no further explanation is given how the 8000+ villages or 359 communes of Burkina Faso will be addressed. The plan needs to give some clearer indication on where and how at village and commune level these *fora villageois* will take place. Also, there is a need to give some better indications on how these fora will be organized in order to give a fair chance to all interested parties to raise their expectations and concerns, considering the particular social structures that exist at local levels (e.g. migrants, transhumance, women versus farmers, autochthons, local nobles).

Also, it is not clear to the TAP why the consultation process is limited through an involvement of the agricultural and environmental extension services only (*services de l'agriculture et de l'environnement*). There is a lot more of expertise available through civil society associations and NGOs that should be better integrated for the consultation purposes. Also, while activities planned for the consultations are generally comprehensive, there is no clear indication on how consultation results will be incorporated into the further planning of REDD+.

Moreover, the R-PP needs to specify how many consultations would likely make up a "phase" of consultation. Burkina rightly recognizes that awareness raising on the issues related to REDD+ and forestry are important first steps for the consultations they need to have. However, awareness rising seems limited to farmers and farmers forums (Table 7) and this should not be the case as it is an important process that all stakeholders need to be involved in.

Finally, the TAP noted that it is also encouraging that Burkina has established a single steering committee to oversee the development of NAMAs, the FIP and the RPP and that there is a Permanent Secretariat under the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (PS-CONEDD) to continue consultation during the phases of REDD+. Considering the wide implication NAMA/RPP-REDD+/FIP has at the country level, there might be the need to inform with the broader public in Burkina about the REDD+ process in order to guarantee a better understanding and appropriation of the types of measure to address climate change mitigation and other measures at the level of land-use.

Recommendations:

There is a need to better address in the R-PP the issues relating to the consultation and participation process in the preparation of REDD+, the extent of ownership within government and national stakeholder community of REDD+, the way how concerns expressed and recommendations of relevant stakeholders are integrated in the REDD+ strategy process and mechanisms for addressing grievances regarding consultation and participation in the REDD-plus process, and for conflict resolution and redress of grievances. So far, the current chapter 1c only describes the consultation and participation plan. The TAP makes the following recommendations:

- More clearly present the objectives of consultation and participants' processes and indicate how the results of the consultation processes will be taken into account in the further planning process of REDD+.
- Describe better the consultation mechanism at the different levels and make some clear indications on where and how these consultations take place, and to whom they are addressed, including taking into account vulnerable and marginalized groups of the society.
- Widen the process of *fora villageois* beyond the current *services de l'agriculture et de l'environnement* to include local associations and NGOs that can contribute to the consultation process.
- Give better indication on how the *fora villageois* will be organized and how many of such fora are planned to be conducted over the time span of the RPP process.
- Consider some activities to present broader information on REDD+ to the wider public in the country

- In respect to the use of information from the consultation process, the TAP recommends to consult the RPP of Nepal (ideas on how community-based experience can be incorporated in REDD+ strategies). The Nepal R-PP is available in FCPF website.
- Elaborate on conflict resolution mechanisms that may arise from the participation processes and the REDD+ process itself.

Revised R-PP- Comments by the TAP (June, 2012; final TAP comments):

While some more explanations have been given on the consultation process, including on its objectives of the consultation process, only few additional information has been given on the consultation mechanisms itself, e.g, on the perceived functioning of the *fora villageois*. Information on how the information will be used still needs to be provided. The consultation process is one of the core activities in the present RP-Plan and an important element in the entire process of R-PP/FIP implementation. Also considering the important budget allocated to the consultation process, it is justified here to be more precise on the contents of the expected outcomes. The design and implementation of the joint RPP/FIP process needs to be based on and utilize transparent stakeholder information sharing and consultation mechanisms that ensure broad community support and the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular affected local people of all origin and local communities. The TAP recommends therefore that Burkina Faso carefully reconsiders the recommendations made above and still gives some more precision on the consultation and participation process.

Conclusions:

→ April 2012 and early June 21012: Standard 1c partially met.

Component 2. Prepare the REDD-plus Strategy

Standard 2a: Assessment of Land Use, Forest Law, Policy, and Governance:

A completed assessment is presented that: identifies major land use trends; assesses direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors in the context of REDD-plus; recognizes major land tenure and natural resource rights and relevant governance issues; documents past successes and failures in implementing policies or measures for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation; identifies significant gaps, challenges, and opportunities to address REDD; and sets the stage for development of the country's REDD strategy to directly address key land use change drivers.

TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard (May, 2012; not final TAP comments):

The sub-component has presented an impressive amount of information on forest cover change and changes over the years (e.g. Tables 9-13). It summarizes good knowledge and understanding of the direct and indirect drivers of deforestation and forest degradation. However, the numbers, particularly changes, are quoted with great certainty that probably can't be justified with the precision pretended (for example, on p. 35, a deforestation rate is quoted to six significant figures while the estimates range by more than 50% or more.) Climate change most likely will continue to be in the direction of less rainfall - Figure 4 on movement of isohyets shows well what has happened so far - this fact should be factored in as agricultural and reforestation plans are developed. Reference could be made here to the 2011 WB Climate Change report mentioned earlier.

The regional separation of classified forests (Figure 3) suggests that some sub national reference level and nested MRV activity might make sense at the beginning. However, classifying new forest is a highly sensitive activity that needs to be done in consultation with and active participation with local populations in order to

be effective and sustainable.

In respect to the analysis of deforestation drivers, it seems that some of the factor have a driving effect in the near future, e.g. demand for energy wood due to rapidly increasing urbanization, increasing areas of gold mining (although scattered over the area, but probably faster than anticipated here) and that its effects are both, environmental and social. A more comprehensive assessment of the potential impacts of such new drivers would be useful. Also, the more recent problem of “land grabbing”/agribusiness in some areas of the country has not received a particular mention as direct or indirect driver of deforestation. Problems linked to the distinction between the rights for land against the right for using trees (droits sur la terre contre les droits sur les arbres) are also not made explicit. Problems relating to forest harvesting (or access to forest resources in general and land-use planning in general) are not considered as important in the document (e.g. as stated on page 59), although they have often been cited in the past as relevant (e.g. in the province of Comoé at the end of the 1999s (Ouédraogo, 1997 ; Hagberg, 2001), in Gourma en 2004 (Korbéogo, 2010), and in Zoundweogo in 2007 (Le pays du 13 août 2007), as well as in Bam in 2010 (Événement, N°190 du 25 juillet 2010). Also, in respect to the interpretation of the law on land (Loi 034-2009/AN portant régime foncier rural), there are different interpretations possible that potentially can create conflicts between the various land-users. The readiness process for REDD+ needs to specifically understand the difficulties and propose solutions that are compatible with the proposed REDD+ strategies.

The sub-section on policies, governance and lessons learned is informative, even though specific commentaries on the effectiveness of the many forestry, environment and natural resource related policies and initiatives on Table 21 was not provided. A summary of the key lessons learnt could improve the sub-section as it would highlight lessons on issues such as i) industrial vs small plantations, ii) production of NFTP, iii) role of participatory forest management and its success factors, iv) harmony between statutory and customary land and natural resource laws, v) cross-sector collaboration and integration of forest management plans into rural development frameworks, vi) valuation of forest service, vii) the role of the private sector and viii) credit facilities to managers.

There is an excellent chart (Table 23) of problems and proposed solutions for forest governance that is a model for other countries (although some solutions proposed need to be more on point or more concrete, e.g. 6, 7, 10, 14, 15, and 16). Also, there is reference without more specification on the National Rural Sector Programme (NHRP) framework that will address the causes of deforestation that lie outside of forests.

Recommendations:

In general terms, this sub-section is well prepared. However, some of the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation should be particularly mentioned and further described (see above).

- Reflect on some important and more recent deforestation and degradation drivers, including the lack of effective land-use planning, urbanization, infrastructural development, industrial and artisanal mining, harvesting of forest products, land grabbing and agro-business and issues relating to possible different interpretation of the Law 034-2009.
- Clarify some inconsistencies in the text, e.g. there is mention on page 46 that the country has benefited from strong institutions and reached a high level of governance; this contradicts with page 43 on the summary of indirect causes of deforestation and degradation, where weak governance is mentioned and linked to “inadequate capacity of the main institutional actions...”.

Revised R-PP- Comments by the TAP (June, 2012; final TAP comments):

The revised R-PP has taken into account most of the comments made by the TAP and has sufficiently addressed the TAP’s recommendations. In general terms, Burkina Faso has identified the major land use trends and has assessed the direct and indirect deforestation and degradation drivers in the most relevant sectors in the context of REDD+. It also recognized major land tenure and natural resource rights and

relevant governance issues. The present chapter well sets the stage for development of the country's REDD+ strategy to directly address key land use change drivers.

Conclusions:

- April 2012: Standard 2a largely met.
- Early June 21012: Standard 2a met.

Standard 2.b: REDD-plus strategy Options:

The R-PP should include: an alignment of the proposed REDD-plus strategy with the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and with existing national and sectoral strategies, and a summary of the emerging REDD-plus strategy to the extent known presently, and of proposed analytic work (and, optionally, ToR) for assessment of the various REDD-plus strategy options. This summary should state: how the country proposes to address deforestation and degradation drivers in the design of its REDD-plus strategy; a plan of how to estimate cost and benefits of the emerging REDD-plus strategy, including benefits in terms of rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and other developmental aspects; socioeconomic, political and institutional feasibility of the emerging REDD-plus strategy; consideration of environmental and social issues; major potential synergies or inconsistencies of country sector strategies in the forest, agriculture, transport, or other sectors with the envisioned REDD-plus strategy; and a plan of how to assess the risk of domestic leakage of greenhouse benefits. The assessments included in the R-PP eventually should result in an elaboration of a fuller, more complete and adequately vetted REDD-plus strategy over time.

TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard (May, 2012; not final TAP comments):

The RPP has presented a draft strategy built around the 4 pillars of (i) Land-use planning management, (ii) Securing Land Rights (tenure reform), (iii) Management of Agro-Sylvo-pastoral and (iv) Capacity Building, Policy Development and promotion of good governance.

The four pillars are reasonable and provide a good general framework for the strategy that is built on the understanding of the drivers. However, as they are described, they are too generic and need to be presented in more detail, including indications on who is responsible for what kind of delivery. As the strategy stands now, it is only at the conceptual phase, and the activities and projects required need to be defined more clearly. For example:

- Capacity building is one of the strategic pillars, but no specific capacity building activities are identified (e.g., technical training for forest measurements, or Geographical Information Systems (GIS) software and database training).
- The strategy relating to the lack of effective land use planning (*schemas régionaux d'aménagement du territoire*, SRAT) is not underpinned in the analysis made in sub-component 2a.
- Also, the strategic pillar on management of agro-sylvo-pastoral systems is not further specified by concrete activities, such as e.g. intensification of land- uses through soil and water conservation, targeted increase of soil fertilization, retention of water, *mise en defens* etc.
- Securing land rights (*sécurisation foncière*) is another important strategic pillar that is insufficiently described in the analytical chapter 2a.
- In addition, the TAP noted that effective land management that is supported by secured land rights and by the use of efficient agro-sylvo-pastoral systems also need secured investment. Access to micro-credits for small land-owners could be another effective measure to underpin the strategic options that are not mentioned as a potential strategy.
- Also, it should be shown clearly where the important question of fuelwood extraction and use and the management of forests by GGF and UGGF are dealt with.

In Table 24, an attempt has been made to link the 4 pillars to measures and expected results but the links

between them are not all clear. In table 25 expected results are expressed as targets (gains to be made between 10 to 20 year of implementation)- but again the key necessary actions are not provided in the table to achieve the results. The goals are laudable, but it's not clear that the expected results (see e.g. Table 26) for proposed emissions reductions are actually achievable without more analysis and identification of the specific activities and projects to be undertaken.

The section basically zooms in on studies that need to be undertaken before a national REDD strategy can be developed (on deforestation and forest degradation, overgrazing & bushfires, lessons from past interventions, policies and programs in key sectors and their relevance to REDD+). These studies would serve as an important step to recognize any gaps and also use past experience to feed into the REDD+ strategy.

The proposal to increase the area under classified forests from 14 to 30% is quite impressive in the context of REDD+ and others, but it is not supported by sufficient detail on how it could be achieved (transformative factors, targets, necessary conditions, costs, and most importantly acceptance at local level). The same is also true of the target to achieve annual reforestation targets of 21,000 ha per year, which is a rather large area considering the overall size of the potential land that has the needed capacities.

Recommendations:

In general terms, since agriculture at large, mining and energy are key drivers, a more targeted approach to formally engage with and influence the policies of agriculture, energy and mining should be strengthened in the strategy. The TAP appreciates and recognizes the fact that studies have been recommended to look at these sectors.

- For each of the four strategic pillars give some more clear ideas on the activities envisaged and show, e.g. in a form of a table, the links between each pillar to expected results and relevant actions to achieve the results. Indicate in a work plan the different activities and show who is responsible for delivery.
- Develop on the absence of effective land-use planning (*aménagement de territoire*) so that it can be better described as one of the strategic pillars of REDD+. Also, take into account the difficulties of the past in advancing on land-use planning at all level and describe an approach that allows some flexibility in this strategic pillar.
- Define the capacity building activities. While it is strategically correct that capacity building is a critical issue in the R-PP, there should be more specifics on critical capacity required to move ahead with the REDD+ Programme (and particularly so because Burkina Faso has already submitted a FIP).
- Provide more clarity on the proposed strategy and programme to increase area under classified forests from today's 14% to 30% in the future, including the afforestation programme and development of NFTP.

Revised R-PP- Comments by the TAP (June, 2012; final TAP comments):

This section has been revised substantially and complemented with most of the information requested by the TAP in its recommendations on the first draft. In particular, there is now a better alignment of the four proposed REDD-plus strategy options with the identified drivers of deforestation and forest degradation, and with existing national and sectoral strategies, including on clarification on addressing land use options, a clearer work plan and the inclusion of capacity building activities. The text is also more explicit on how the country proposes to address deforestation and degradation drivers in the design of its REDD-plus strategy options. The section is formulated in a way so that it allows an elaboration of a fuller, more complete and adequately vetted REDD-plus strategy over time, based on the further analysis and experience which will be done in implementing the R-PP. What still is needed is a plan to better estimate cost and benefits of the emerging REDD-plus strategy options, including benefits in terms of rural livelihoods, biodiversity conservation and other developmental aspects and a plan of how to assess the

risk of domestic leakage of greenhouse benefits in the future. Overall, the choice of strategic options is now clearer and the TAP is of the view that the quality of the proposed options is sufficient at this stage.

Conclusions:

- April 2012: Standard 2b partially met.
- Early June 2012: Standard 2b largely met.

Standard 2.c: REDD-plus implementation framework:

Describes activities (and optionally provides ToR in an annex) and a work plan to further elaborate institutional arrangements and issues relevant to REDD-plus in the country setting. Identifies key issues involved in REDD-plus implementation, and explores potential arrangements to address them; offers a work plan that seems likely to allow their full evaluation and adequate incorporation into the eventual Readiness Package. Key issues are likely to include: assessing land ownership and carbon rights for potential REDD-plus strategy activities and lands; addressing key governance concerns related to REDD-plus; and institutional arrangements needed to engage in and track REDD-plus activities and transactions.

TAP’s assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard (May, 2012; not final TAP comments):

This sub-component has proposed and described the key elements to constitute the implementation framework for REDD+ in Burkina Faso. These include: (i) An inter-sectoral coordination mechanism run by the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development; (ii) A legal framework, which will confer carbon ownership rights and also govern the distribution of benefits. However, in the TAP’s view, due to Burkina’s long history of participatory forest management through a devolved system of rights and responsibilities, there should already be interesting elements at disposal that can help to clarify on issue relating to carbon ownership; (iii) Establishment of standards for REDD+ Projects in Burkina Faso; (iv) A project registry for all REDD+ projects; (v) A financing mechanism and institutional options for REDD+.

The national programme for the rural sector (*Programme national du secteur rural*, PNSR) is proposed to be the main coordination tool between environment, agriculture and rangeland/livestock sectors for REDD+ implementation. In the view of the TAP, this is a good approach that allows to effectively deal with institutional arrangements for REDD+ implementation. However, as mining seems to be an important sector in respect to land-use and deforestation/degradation, it might be suitable to also integrate the respective ministry in the coordination framework.

The idea of a pre-financing mechanism that could offer subsidies in the form of advance payments to implementers in anticipation of future carbon sequestration gains is an interesting proposal, but there is a need for a more evidence based analysis to better understand the rationale behind it. The pre-financing mechanism, redistribution of national benefits, and establishment of a National Fund need thus further explanation and it would be of interest to know more about the acceptance of such a National Fund from both donors and private investors.

The section should be more specific in respect to the work plan and on questions about which institution is responsible for what. Thus, the implementation plan should be made somehow more concrete in respect to implementation. E.g. the range of activities proposed in the REDD+ strategy should be referred to in chapter B and illustrated in (e.g. also in Figure 10 of French version which is Figure 9 in the English version).

Recommendations:

While the above elements are indeed relevant and well articulated in the document, the sub-component can be improved by some additions.

- Providing more clarity on the institutional mandates of the key sectors / players in the implementation and monitoring of REDD+ Programmes and Projects
- Reflect on the need to better integrate the mining sector into REDD+ implementation framework
- Reflect on adding a national carbon accounting system to the computerized registry of REDD+ Projects (it may be implied but it needs to be explicit)
- Also reflect on adding an information sharing platform on REDD+ to the registry of Projects
- Provide rough TORs for the main studies proposed.

Revised R-PP- Comments by the TAP (June, 2012; final TAP comments):

More clarity has been given on the institutional mandates of the key players in the sector, including description of additional players (e.g. international technical and financial partners). The link between the R-PP and the FIP has been clarified in respect to the REDD+ implementation framework. Some more lucidity has been given on the work plan to further elaborate institutional arrangements and issues relevant to REDD-plus in the country setting. The key issues involved in REDD-plus implementation are generally listed, though not in clear order. Still missing are some thoughts on the need to better integrate the mining sector into REDD+ implementation framework. Also, some clearer information on the actions proposed (section G) without going into details (eventually refer to the TORs of the consultants under 1a).

Conclusions:

- ➔ April 2012: Standard 2c partially met.
- ➔ Early June 2012: Improvements have been made, but some of the important elements of the assessment above have not been addressed. Standard 2c still partially met.

Standard 2.d: Social and Environmental Impacts during Readiness Preparation and REDD-plus Implementation:

The proposal includes a program of work for due diligence for strategic environmental and social impact assessment in compliance with the World Bank's or UN-REDD Programme's safeguard policies, including methods to evaluate how to address those impacts via studies, consultations, and specific mitigation measures aimed at preventing or minimizing adverse effects. For countries receiving funding via the World Bank, a simple work plan is presented for how the SESA process will be followed, and for preparation of the ESMF.

TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard (May, 2012; not final TAP comments):

A good proposal has been made in the Draft R-PP to use the SESA of FIP projects to update the SESA of REDD+ as a whole. The TORs for the SESA have been well described in Annex 2d (page 139). The section duly recognizes that SESA is in two tiers of do-no-harm and promoting positive impacts. But this is not yet a work plan for how the SESA process will be followed, and the ESMF is mentioned only briefly. There is no reference or mention of existing legislation and policies that require EIAs or SESA in Burkina Faso. It should also be noted that the proposed new rural land system should be done based on the entire natural resource sector (including land-use, agriculture and forestry) and not solely because of REDD+. For a country with a long history of tacking production under decreasing amounts of rainfall, there is no reference to the Concept of Environmental Safeguards as contained in Cancun Agreements and its inclusion into the proposed MRV system for Burkina Faso.

Recommendations:

- Refer to the Environmental and Social Safeguards under REDD+ and indicate if there is sufficient or insufficient policy support for them in Burkina Faso
- Refer to the fact that social and environmental safeguards will also be covered under the proposed MRV System
- Give special attention to social impacts of REDD+, and in particular to the effects that the REDD+ strategic options have in respect to gender.
- Reflect on the provisions for consultancy work and assess if the work can be efficiently done with the resources allocated to the task.

Revised R-PP- Comments by the TAP (June, 2012; final TAP comments):

The TAP observed that none of the recommendations made by the TAP has been addressed.

Conclusions:

- ➔ April 2012 and early June 2012: Standard 2d largely met.

Component 3. Develop a Reference Level

Standard 3: Reference Level:

Present work plan for how the reference level for deforestation, forest degradation (if desired), conservation, sustainable management of forest, and enhancement of carbon stocks will be developed. Include early ideas on a process for determining which approach and methods to use (e.g., forest cover change and GHG emissions based on historical trends, and/or projections into the future of historical trend data; combination of inventory and/or remote sensing, and/or GIS or modeling), major data requirements, and current capacity and capacity requirements. Assess linkages to components 2a (assessment of deforestation drivers), 2b (REDD-plus strategy activities), and 4 (MRV system design).

(FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a stepwise approach may be useful. This component states what early activities are proposed.)

TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard (May, 2012; not final TAP comments):

This section is a good start on the development of a reference level, recognizes the issues of when the baseline should be applied, and notes the existence of uncontrollable events. It is true that there is no established standard for the methodology that should be used here, but other countries have been able to come up with sensible and logical plans that can be accommodated within a variety of possible regulation scenarios (e.g., Kenya, Ghana, and Mozambique). Given the limited data, Burkina Faso is using the stock difference method, which is reasonable.

The reference level measurements should focus on those areas where change is taking place rather than trying to do the entire country - this makes sense because the forests are concentrated in certain regions.

It is fortunate that Burkina Faso has a database on land use which covers the 1992-2001 period and was updated in 2010. The TAP also noted that for estimation of carbon stocks, the inventory that is currently underway will be used to generate the data. However, there are a number of basic elements that need to be described in this component of the RPP, including

- The method of analysis is not clear although that a mathematical model (multivariate model) has been proposed to analyze changes in the parameters that have been listed
- No forest definitions have been provided to be used in Burkina
- The chosen carbon pools seems to be above and below ground woody biomass but this is not explicitly mentioned what pools are considered under which circumstances
- There is no mention of any proposal to estimate historical emissions or the period which has been

chosen as the reference period (e.g. the last 10 years). In addition, there is not enough attention to how drivers may change in the future.

- No methodology of formulae for converting biomass into carbon equivalents have been mentioned
- The RPP recognizes that a baseline scenario is needed to measure results in reducing net forest emissions but no methodology is yet proposed in this regard.

There is a lack of assessment of linkages to components 2a (assessment of deforestation drivers), 2b (REDD-plus strategy activities), and 4 (MRV system design).

Also the section does not delve into the current capacity and capacity requirements that Burkina needs to develop the reference level.

Recommendations:

Deal with the issues listed above in order to complement the information needed to fully assess the methodology for the development of a reference level.

Revised R-PP- Comments by the TAP (June, 2012; final TAP comments):

There is some new material in section 3 that mentions partner institutions, with no specifics, and a few general remarks on the nomenclature of the land use data base (BDOT). But the recommendations that the TAP have listed in its review of the April 2012 version have not been addressed in any substantive way. While the TAP is aware that the establishment of the RL/REL is an integral part of Project 2 of the FIP, there is some need to specify in the R-PP early ideas on a process for determining which approach and methods to use, major data requirements, and current capacity and capacity requirements. Also, it is important to assess linkages to components 2a (assessment of deforestation drivers), 2b (REDD-plus strategy activities), and 4 (MRV system design). The TAP recommends to the proponents to address the specific recommendations as listed above, in particular

- Address some of the missing elements listed in the assessment above, including some notion on forest definitions and a statement on the methodology for converting biomass to carbon;
- Reflect on a reference period over which historical emissions will be estimated and used to generate reference levels and reference emission levels
- List the elements of a work plan that shows what specific activities will take place, when they will be completed, and who is responsible. The TAP had suggested in its last review that the reference level plans for Kenya, Mozambique, and Cambodia be consulted in order to get some ideas on a reasonable work plan.
- Clarify how the stated model will use key drivers of deforestation and forest degradation to build reference scenarios (which includes input to the reference scenario of data on crop-specific agricultural expansion, grazing and wood consumption).
- Better include capacity building work in the activities to develop a baseline scenario

Conclusions:

- ➔ April 2012 and early June 2012: Standard 3 is partially met

Component 4. Design a Monitoring System**Standard 4a: Emissions and Removals:**

The R-PP provides a proposal and workplan for the initial design, on a stepwise basis, of an integrated monitoring system of measurement, reporting and verification of changes in deforestation and/or forest degradation, and forest enhancement activities. The system design should include early ideas on enhancing country capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities) to monitor emissions reductions and enhancement of forest carbon stocks, and to assess the impacts of the REDD-plus strategy in the forest sector.

The R-PP should describe major data requirements, capacity requirements, how transparency of the monitoring system and data will be addressed, early ideas on which methods to use, and how the system would engage participatory approaches to monitoring by forest-dependent indigenous peoples and other forest dwellers. It should also address independent monitoring and review, involving civil society and other stakeholders, and how findings would be fed back to improve REDD-plus implementation. The proposal should present early ideas on how the system could evolve into a mature REDD-plus monitoring system with the full set of capabilities.

(FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. The R-PP states what early activities are proposed.

TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard (May, 2012; not final TAP comments):

Under Component 4a, the general principles for measuring and reporting on carbon has been described and it demonstrates, by and large, an understating of what MRV is about and the need to define emission factors. It seems that forest cover maps used in the current inventory and satellite image maps from BODT will be used in the design of the MRV system. Volume and/or biomass data from the current National Forest Inventory will be used to estimate carbon stock above ground and studies will be designed to get more accurate estimates of underground biomass.

The general plan is reasonable, with a mixture of remote sensing information and land surveys. Whether it is necessary to cover the entire country with a categorization of land use with a minimum area of 0.25 ha is open to question - it might be better to use a grid with variable spacing, with smaller spacing where change is rapid and larger spacing where there is less change. There is a focus here on using the stock-difference method which builds on traditional forest inventories to estimate sequestration or emissions. The TAP suggest that the proponents might want to consider moving towards using the gain-loss method that is built on the ecological understanding of the existing forests and on the information about the anthropogenic processes producing carbon losses. The choice of method will depend largely on the availability of data and the resources necessary to collect additional data.

Also the TAP questions the impact on the *RapidEye* data of cloud cover. Are there enough images available to reduce that effect to a minimum? It might be possible to reduce the cost of data by working through the international Group on *Earth Observations Forest Carbon Task* which is aimed at providing low cost remote sensing data.

It will also be important to include GIS training and GIS support so that the information gathered can be used in the most useful way and is available to the broadest set of users and stakeholders. The GIS systems also greatly assist in providing transparency for users at all levels.

Given that much work would be done by contracting consulting and technical firms, how much ownership would the government agencies/scientific institutions of Burkina have? What is the plan for sustainability in terms of the government managing its own affairs under the REDD+? In the TAP's view, these are important capacity elements that need to be adequately reflected in the R-PP.

The budget seems reasonable.

Recommendations:

This component still needs a work plan with actions, responsible parties, and deliverables - the MRV plans developed by Kenya, Mozambique, Guyana, and Cambodia are excellent examples of what is required here.

- Clarify the sampling design that will be used at the national level.
- Explain what is meant with partial validation as mentioned under the section that relates to Validation and Communication of MRV
- Comment on existing national capacity and if the need arises, develop more on capacity building elements for MRV development in Burkina in the RPP proposal
- Reflect on how communities and other local stakeholders could be included in the MRV process, in particular also in respect to the monitoring of a number of non-carbon variables such as drivers, governance indicators etc.

Revised R-PP- Comments by the TAP (June, 2012; final TAP comments):

- 1) New material has been provided, mainly a justification of the use of the stock-change or stock-difference method and why that is appropriate now. The TAP concludes that the stock-change method is appropriate.
- 2) Also there is mention that there will be a parallel process for monitoring the implementation of the strategy to improve it over time, which in the TAP's view is a good step.
- 3) Some elements of the recommendations, e.g. on the use of technology, the questions relating to existing capacities on MRV in the country still need to be addressed.

Conclusions:

- ➔ Assessment in April 2102 and **early June 2012: Standard 4a partially met.**

Standard 4b: Other Multiple Benefits, Impacts, and Governance:

The R-PP provides a proposal for the initial design and a workplan, including early ideas on capability (either within an integrated system, or in coordinated activities), for an integrated monitoring system that includes addressing other multiple benefits, impacts, and governance. Such benefits may include, e.g., rural livelihoods, conservation of biodiversity, key governance factors directly pertinent to REDD-plus implementation in the country.

(The FCPF and UN-REDD recognize that key international policy decisions may affect this component, so a staged approach may be useful. The R-PP states what early activities are proposed.)

TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard (May, 2012; not final TAP comments):

There are many specific issues of co-benefits, and these are referred to briefly in the early stages of the plan. But the discussion here is entirely generic, with just a short statement that a plan will be developed. What is needed is a work plan with activities and a time line. Other benefits than carbon relate not only to biodiversity as insinuated in the current draft, but also to issues such as livelihoods, cultural values, governance, water, soils, climate change adaptation measures in respect to forest and land-use; there is the need to monitor such factors in the REDD+ readiness process. The proposed study to quantify the potential of biodiversity of the various conservation measures thus does not suffice.

The section needs to be developed with a proper work plan and a clear link to the overall MRV system proposed.

Recommendations:

- Rework and complement the component on multiple benefits, impacts and governance, or, at least, make the relevant references to other activities (e.g. in the framework of the FIP) that take care of this section.

Revised R-PP- Comments by the TAP (June, 2012; final TAP comments):

While some specifications have been given in respect to the development of a methodology for monitoring of co-benefit based on “traditional approaches”, the necessary references to the wider programme (FIP) have not been given. The proponents should at least give an indication how in the wider process MRV of co-benefit is handled. This is important as the REDD+ process contributes to broader sustainable development; this includes a number of co-benefits, *inter alia* improving local livelihoods, building transparent and effective forest/land-use governance structures, making progress on securing land tenure and enhancing or maintaining biodiversity and/or other ecosystem services. The combined process RPP/FIP should have clear ideas on how to monitor and report on these non-carbon benefits as feasible, taking note of existing and emerging guidance on monitoring of non-carbon benefits by the UNFCCC, CBD, and other relevant platforms.

Conclusions:

- ➔ April 2012: Standard 4b not met. It is too generic in the current state.
- ➔ Early June 2012: A few new statements, but they do not make this section as specific as the TAP has asked for. Standard 4b partially met.

Component 5. Schedule and Budget

Standard 5: Completeness of information and resource requirements

The R-PP proposes a full suite of activities to achieve REDD readiness, and identifies capacity building and financial resources needed to accomplish these activities. A budget and schedule for funding and technical support requested from the FCPF and/or UN-REDD, as well as from other international sources (e.g., bilateral assistance), are summarized by year and by potential donor. The information presented reflects the priorities in the R-PP, and is sufficient to meet the costs associated with REDD-plus readiness activities identified in the R-PP. Any gaps in funding, or sources of funding, are clearly noted.

TAP’s assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard (May, 2012; not final TAP comments):

A budget and road map, based on the priorities in the R-PP, but in particular the road map remains at a very general level and needs to be more specific. Some of the budget items are excessively high, e.g. consultation or contracting of a study firm for AT. Given the lack of activities proposed in the components, the budget does not contain all essential activities needed to achieve REDD readiness.

Recommendations:

The budget needs to be revised after the earlier components that lack work plans have been revised to reflect the recommendations to meet the standards. In addition, also consider to:

- Develop on activities relating to capacity building
- Review the budget lines under some of the components, e.g. review excessive budget for consultations (US\$ 2.4 m), reconsider the budgeting for the recruitment of a study firm for AT at CN-REDD. Also consider reviewing funds allocation for SESA (which is rather an underestimation)
- Show clearly the contribution of the Government of Burkina Faso to the realization of the RPP

Revised R-PP- Comments by the TAP (June, 2012; final TAP comments)::

Some explanation has been provided in respect to the budget that still remains generic. As the RPP is considered as an integrative part of the wider FIP programme, some of the initially assessed excessive budget items are more comprehensible now as they are defined of having a broader role in the overall context of REDD+ development.

The overall schedule is well presented, though not sufficiently clear on why a specific activity takes place in a particular period of time.

Conclusions:

- April 2012: Standard 5 partially met
- Early June 2012: Taking into consideration the information provided that the ad-hoc structures created are serving the implementation of the R-PP and FIP programme elements simultaneously, the overall budget figures seem to be reasonable, thus Standard 5 largely met.

Component 6. Design a Program Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

Standard 6: The R-PP adequately describes the indicators that will be used to monitor program performance of the Readiness process and R-PP activities, and to identify in a timely manner any shortfalls in performance timing or quality. The R-PP demonstrates that the framework will assist in transparent management of financial and other resources, to meet the activity schedule.

TAP's assessment of how well R-PP meets this standard (May, 2012; not final TAP comments):

A good start has been made with the chart that has been developed with activities, outputs, and indicators. Some additional detail would be useful, particularly for the indicators, which tend to be very general - mostly "decree signed" or "report." The monitoring indicators are generic and seem more of "tick the box" kind of elements. Indicators such as "report" for consultation activities are not appropriate. For instance the indicator here could be the dissemination of the report, how many stakeholders have been involved over time, etc. There is no discussion of how these will be monitored, or how the framework will assist in transparent management.

Recommendations:

This section needs some further work.

Revised R-PP- Comments by the TAP:

Some changes have been made at the level of indicators in particular. At the current stage, this section is sufficiently well elaborated

Conclusions:

- April 2012: Standard 5 partially met
- Early June 2012: Standard 5 largely met.

See also additional observations in French presented in the Annex below.

ANNEX: Extracts of observations and suggestions made by TAP members that illustrates some of elements of the consolidated TAP review. This annex is meant to be complementary and informative.

FORA VILLAGEOIS (Section 1c)

L'architecture de concertation est fondée à la base sur des fora villageois (p. 31). Mais le RPP ne précise pas si ces fora auront lieu dans tous les villages du Burkina Faso. Si c'est le cas, l'objectif ne paraît pas réaliste dans un pays qui compte plus de 8 000 villages. Mais, si ce n'est pas le cas, rien n'est dit sur les critères qui détermineront le choix des villages où ils auront lieu? Il en va de même des réunions de synthèses dans les communes dans un pays qui en compte 359. Il aurait été souhaitable que le plan fournisse des éclaircissements sur la faisabilité de ces foras.

D'autre part, si ces fora peuvent constituer un moyen de participation des populations locales au processus de REDD+, il ne faut cependant pas sous-estimer les problèmes et difficultés que peut entraîner leur mise en œuvre. En effet, malgré la dimension participative de ces foras, ils ne garantissent pas une prise de parole effective et libre de tous les groupes d'acteurs du fait que certains d'entre eux n'ont pas les mêmes droits vis-à-vis de la terre et des ressources forestières. Par exemple, les femmes n'ont le plus souvent aucun droit formel à la terre et aux forêts. Il y a donc le risque que ces foras se déroulent sous le contrôle de quelques participants (autochtones, membres des lignages royaux) alors qu'ils doivent permettre l'expression du plus grand nombre afin de mettre en évidence des problèmes et des contradictions entre groupes. Parce que dans ces fora, le contrôle social y est très puissant et les censures ou autocensures courantes. Certaines catégories d'acteurs (migrants, femmes, jeunes, éleveurs peuls, transhumants...) qui ont conscience de la fragilité de leur position sociale sur les questions foncières par rapport aux autochtones (leurs hôtes, logeurs) peuvent ainsi rester à la marge ou briller par leur silence. Ce qui peut compromettre l'utilisation et la gestion durables des forêts pour l'atténuation des changements climatiques. De ce fait, je propose que pour permettre une meilleure participation de tous ces groupes d'acteurs, les agents des services techniques de l'Etat qui sont censés assurer l'animation de ces fora soient dotés d'un certain nombre de compétences. Il s'agit non seulement de la connaissance des techniques d'animation de groupe, de la psychosociologie des groupes restreints mais plus largement de la connaissance des normes de fonctionnements sociaux des sociétés villageoises (clivages, rapports de force qui traversent ces sociétés).

Par ailleurs, pour ne pas donner aux populations locales l'impression d'une mainmise des services étatiques, et donc du gouvernement sur la conduite du processus de REDD+ et partant entraver leur participation dans ce processus, des représentants des communautés villageoises (membres de conseils villageois de développement par exemple) pourraient être pleinement associés à la conduite des fora villageois dans le but de combiner légalité et légitimité.

Enfin, pour assurer une très large publicisation et une meilleure appropriation du processus REDD+, en particulier ses tenants et aboutissants, ses avantages (et éventuelles contraintes) au niveau du grand public (notamment les communautés locales), je propose l'usage diversifié d'outils et supports d'information et de communication : la publication d'articles de presse en langues nationale, les conférences et causeries débat, les productions et diffusion de films documentaires, les productions et diffusion d'émissions radiotélévisées ; les productions de spectacles à travers les théâtres forum, etc.

La campagne de sensibilisation publique conçue pour le processus REDD+ et pour chacune des activités pertinentes du projet devrait également cibler délibérément certains groupes de la population (femmes, jeunes, éleveurs) qui, autrement, pourraient ne pas avoir accès à ces informations.

ELEMENTS ANALYTIQUES (Section 2a)

Les enquêtes de terrain conduites ces dernières années dans les régions du Centre Ouest (provinces du Ziro et de la Sissili) et de l'Ouest (province du Houet) que ces agro-businessmen se livrent, à des fins agro-sylvo-pastorales (cultures vivrières et commerciales, agro-carburants (jatropha), élevage, etc.), à des défrichements au bulldozer (toutes les études récentes sur le sujet le confirment) sur des réserves foncières généralement couvertes par une végétation arborée dense à très dense, constituant des forêts secondaires sur des jachères de 30 ans ou plus. En outre, les défrichements se font en ouvrant des champs d'un seul tenant, sans aucun plan d'aménagement antiérosif fait au préalable, s'étendant souvent sur plusieurs dizaines d'hectares. Le plus frappant est que ces défrichements n'épargnent même pas les espèces ligneuses protégées par la loi (les karités, les nérés, les tamariniers, les baobabs et autres), qui devraient constituer le parc arboré, jouant un rôle essentiel dans la conservation des eaux et du sol en zone tropicale. Les champs ainsi ouverts, ne font pas non plus l'objet d'une réinstallation d'espèces ligneuses ou herbacées pérennes dans des bandes antiérosives revégétalisées, sauf en cas de plantation de vergers (manguiers, anacardes, agrumes) ou de clôtures (généralement en Eucalyptus). Comparativement, les agriculteurs pauvres ne défrichent que sur des petites parcelles de 0,25 ha à 0,5ha.

Il importe également de noter la distinction entre les droits sur la terre et les droits sur les arbres, fréquente dans le système coutumier burkinabè. Cette distinction justifiée dans ce système par la reconnaissance des fruits du travail passé est à prendre compte d'autant qu'elle est source de conflits tant au sein des communautés entre autochtones et migrants lorsque ces arbres constituent une source privilégiée de revenus (karité, néré, etc.). Toujours sur les conflits, il est surprenant de lire dans le volet problèmes (p.59) que les conflits liés à l'exploitation des forêts et l'accès à celles-ci ne sont pas des conflits "graves". Alors que la presse et les chercheurs reportent fréquemment que les conflits en particulier entre agriculteurs et éleveurs sont de plus en plus violents, voire meurtriers. Ce fut le cas dans la province de la Comoé à la fin des années 90 (Ouédraogo, 1997 ; Hagberg, 2001), dans le Gourma en 2004 (Korbéogo, 2010), dans le Zoundweogo en 2007 (Le pays du 13 août 2007), dans le Bam en 2010 (Événement, N°190 du 25 juillet 2010), etc.

Signalons également que le niveau d'information des populations sur la loi 034-2009/AN portant régime foncier rural est variable d'un village à l'autre et des migrants aux autochtones ; cela entraîne des appréciations divergentes quant aux effets de cette loi. Pour plusieurs migrants, la nouvelle loi constituera un rempart contre les conflits fonciers et constituera une garantie pour les générations futures quant à leurs droits de propriété sur les terres léguées par leurs ascendants. Pour les autochtones propriétaires de terres au contraire, la loi n'apportera que des conséquences négatives quant à l'insécurité foncière de leurs héritiers par la réattribution de certaines de leurs terres aux migrants. Certains chefs de ménages affirment qu'ils sont prêts à utiliser tous les moyens mystiques, physiques et sociaux en leurs dispositions pour empêcher l'application de la nouvelle loi.

Dans ce contexte d'attentes variées et contradictoires chaque groupe d'acteurs développe des stratégies de pré-positionnement pour tirer le meilleur partie lors de l'application de la loi. Ces stratégies provoquent une activation des conflits de nationalités (autochtones vs migrants). Face à cette situation, je propose que la REDD+ s'investisse, à la mise en place des projets d'appui, dans l'identification des conflits potentiels de cette loi pour rechercher les moyens de les éviter dans la mesure du possible. Elle peut également faciliter l'accès aux

attestations de possession foncière afin que les communautés se sentent responsables de leurs terres et que l'Etat joue son rôle de contrôle et de régulation. Cela peut s'obtenir soit par la prise en charge des charges fiscales et techniques relatives à l'acquisition de ces attestations soit par la simplification des conditions fiscales et techniques d'acquisition dudit titre.

DOMAINE FONCIER (Sections 2a et 2b)

Le gouvernement du Burkina Faso fait un effort considérable dans le sens des réformes dans le domaine foncier et forestier. Les récentes relectures du code forestier en 2011 et de la création de la loi foncière rurale en 2009 montrent une volonté de remettre à niveaux les différentes limites et injustices que des secteurs divers de ces codes et des acteurs ont connues à travers les anciens codes. Le R-PP également s'inscrit dans l'actualité des différents droits réécrits ou précisés.

Le R-PP a identifié les moteurs de la déforestation et de la dégradation parmi lesquels l'expansion agricole, le surpâturage, l'exploitation minière, sont retenus comme étant les facteurs le plus important. En plus le R-PP met en lumière qu'il faut des mesures d'aménagement du territoire, une sécurisation foncière, l'aménagement et la gestion des ressources, et enfin un renforcement des capacités des acteurs.

Même si le document n'ignore pas les réalités des questions foncières au Burkina qui débouchent très souvent sur les conflits, il ne pose pas cela comme étant un préalable à maîtriser et à contenir dans le processus de préparation à la REDD. Toutes les questions foncières ne sont pas résolues jusque et cela malgré les nouvelles lois. Le pluralisme juridique qui est le contexte des rapports fonciers dans le Burkina rural ne permet pas l'application des nouvelles lois foncières qui profitent à certains acteurs. Les acteurs sont ballotés dans un contexte juridique qui reste toujours flou où en réalité seul le droit coutumier (règles et pratiques locales) est d'usage selon les contextes, les intérêts, la ressource en jeu, l'histoire foncière et politique (en cas de réinstallation dans les vallées aménagées). Il faut de ce fait s'assurer d'une identification de toutes les tenures foncières en cours, des pratiques foncières locales (en tenant compte de celles qui cherchent déjà à s'adapter aux nouveaux textes (Coralis Vos, 2011).

Pour cela, il s'impose d'avoir un mapping des tenures et des types de droit existant. Cependant il faudrait absolument contextualiser ces mapping en le reliant aux contextes divers : les populations par exemple qui sont déplacés des lits de barrages sur de nouvelles terres « d'intérieur » etc. Dans ce mapping il faudrait établir les différents droits et opportunités des femmes afin que nous mesurions avec la REDD ce qu'elles pourraient gagner, renforcer ou perdre. Par exemple dans la loi 034, il est acquis que l'Etat et les collectivités territoriales peuvent organiser des programmes spéciaux d'attribution à titre individuel ou collectif de terres aux femmes. Cependant jusque là, cette loi ne peut profiter aux femmes qui sont soumises dans leurs milieux domestiques et sociale à la tenure foncière traditionnelle en cours qui n'a pas encore changé. L'Etat nous le savons n'est pas outillé pour accompagner ces types de changements au niveau local. La mise en place de « Chartres foncières » prévues dans la loi n'est pas encore appliquée. Si elles le sont cela pourrait profiter au CC-REDD

Conséquence sur la gouvernance foncière et forestière de la compréhension de la séquestration et de la gestion des stocks carbone : Lorsque les communautés comprendront ce que pourrait rapporter la séquestration du carbone en acceptant de s'impliquer dans la conservation des terres dégradées et des jachères, il y aura des retraits de terres incontrôlées et des remises en question des limites foncières en lignages et entre « autochtones » et migrants. La titrisation pourrait faciliter Ce processus. Cependant quels impacts pour les rapports fonciers qui risquent de déboucher sur les conflits ? Qu'advient-il des terres de cultures des femmes (qui sont déjà échangées a chaque saison pour permettre la rotation des cultures de l'époux).

Il faudrait de ce fait que la maîtrise foncière dans les villages soit un préalable. Il faudrait pour venir à bout de cette maîtrise foncière locale entreprendre des recensements des exploitations et des ressources communes déjà initiés au préalable par le Laboratoire citoyenneté dans les départements de Padéma, Banwaly en 2007, 2008 accompagné par le PDL-O et la direction régionale de l'Institut National des Statistiques et de la Démographie (INSD). Ces recensements ont la particularité d'avoir été conduits par les populations elles mêmes. Ces populations ont également été impliqués afin d'identifier et de répertorier les pratiques et transactions foncières jugées selon elles de légitimes ou de non légitimes. Les populations pourraient ainsi contribuer dans les mappings des tenures et de pratiques foncières. Cela diminuerait les coûts qui seraient affectés à cet effet.