



Forest Investment Project

Country / Region: **Cote d'Ivoire** | Project Id: **XFIPCI029A** | Fund Name: **FIP** |

MDB : **International Bank for Reconstruction and Development**

Comment Type	Commenter Name	Commenter Profile	Comment	Date
Comment 1	Gaia Allison	United Kingdom	<p>Thank you for providing the UK with additional time to review this proposal. There is much in this proposal that we are pleased to see. For example: the inclusion of lesson learning from Benin on benefit sharing, government commitment to co-management and independent civil society monitoring; innovative measures to de-couple land ownership from the ability to participate in project activities. We also appreciate the effort to integrate gender and youth employment into the proposal, reflected through targeted activities, allocated budget and reflected in the results reporting.</p> <p>However, some activities appear to comprise a straightforward allocation of FIP resources to already ongoing activities. This may be entirely justified, but if so, it is important to set out the added value of this approach. It needs to be clear how FIP resources will help lead to transformational change, and, if investment is in basic recurrent costs such as supervision or surveillance, what investment in systemic change is taking place to ensure that these activities can be sustained into the future?</p> <p>There is a significant focus on awareness raising in the two delivery components, which we suspect also requires significant budget. Can you be more explicit about what form this will take? Given this builds on work already being carried out, particularly in the environs of the Tai National Park, we would like to see some evidence of efficacy of these awareness raising investments. With respect specifically to the illegal artisanal gold mining, it is our experience that awareness raising bears little fruit and unless significantly more attractive alternative livelihood opportunities exist, these activities will continue with or without awareness campaigns. Have awareness campaigns been good value for money in the TNP?</p> <p>There is a strong focus on seeking alternative livelihoods – can you set out clearly what makes this scheme different from past failures?</p> <p>Is there any intention to ensure synergies with the DGM across some of these activities (for example targetting the same geographical areas)?</p> <p>Component 1</p> <p>Can you clarify whether the local committees to be formed include representatives from multiple villages or single villages? Can you also clarify the number of participatory GF management plans envisaged as there seems to be some discrepancy between the number in the text (5) and the number in the results framework (4)</p> <p>On the reforestation activities we note a centralised nursery approach to raising seedlings. Have alternative options been explored to work with private sector suppliers and/or existing nurseries closer to the reforestation sites? Generation of seedlings could be part of the livelihood initiatives and incentive system?</p> <p>On the activities to support zero deforestation agriculture – could you provide a little more information on the “cocoa industry”? Given the recent joint framework for action on cocoa and forest announced in COP 23, will the project team explore opportunities to link with the “cocoa industry” that has signed up?</p> <p>Whilst we appreciate the opportunity to support organised returns of migrants back to the central belt, we still have some reservations about the relative cost-benefit of the voluntary migration component. The target is to support 100 families. Is this part of a broader strategy with full government financial support? It strikes us as potentially an expensive pilot if this does not have a realistic prospect of sustained and strategic support including provisions for basic services for the returnees for example. We would appreciate more information on this.</p> <p>Component 2</p> <p>See question above about surveillance</p> <p>A relatively modest sum of \$1 million is provided for enhancing livelihoods of</p>	Nov 29, 2017



communities around the Tai national park. The proposal states that the scale of the challenge is significant. Can you provide some information on how you intend to get the best value from these efforts.

Risks

Thank you for a thorough risk assessment and clear mitigation plans particularly around financial risk.

under social risks – has social analysis picked up any potential exclusion issues associated with the different nationalities/ethnicities of migrants – for example in committee structures?

Response 1 Meerim Shakirova

IBRD

Nov 30, 2017

Many thanks. The team is very appreciative for the support and comments received from the UK at the IP stage, which contributed to improving the project proposal.

Specific comments

Comment: However, some activities appear to comprise a straightforward allocation of FIP resources to already ongoing activities. This may be entirely justified, but if so, it is important to set out the added value of this approach.

It needs to be clear how FIP resources will help lead to transformational change, and, if investment is in basic recurrent costs such as supervision or surveillance, what investment in systemic change is taking place to ensure that these activities can be sustained into the future?

Response: The team welcomes this comment and would like to reassure the UK that the goal of supporting these on-going activities is to support development of a strong enabling environment for transformational change. Unfortunately, in the past, due to limited resources being allocated by Government to these activities, their impacts were insufficient to establish the base needed for systemic change. The Government is now relying on this first 5-year phase of the project to co-finance recurrent costs for surveillance and for the close supervision of the implementation of management plans which will pave the way for the transformational change not yet achieved in the sector. Importantly, this support allows for the full involvement of local communities in GF co-management, which when coupled with contributions to recurrent costs, will reinvigorate the sector and set the bases for sustainable forest management. In addition, these activities will support the realization of the Government's strategy to transform the sector as defined in the new forest sector policy (Déclaration de Politique Forestière 2017) focused on a zero-deforestation agriculture and sustainable management of the country's protected areas (GFs and National Parks).

Comment: There is a significant focus on awareness raising in the two delivery components, which we suspect also requires significant budget. Can you be more explicit about what form this will take?

Response: Past experiences (especially with two Bank-financed projects in Benin: Forest and Adjacent Lands Management Project and the Protected Areas Management project), have shown that the use of rural radio announcements, village meetings led by community leaders, and working with local NGOs are the best ways to raise awareness at the grassroots level and to gain community support and involvement in forestry projects implementation. Throughout project preparation, a South-South exchange between Benin and RCI was established to build on successes in Benin, including partnerships with rural radio stations, community leaders and local NGOs for the dissemination of project information. Furthermore, at the onset of the project, a communication strategy will be developed to guide awareness raising activities (key audiences and key messages will be carefully defined, including successful means to deliver messages). (The full cost of the awareness raising activities under the project is: \$382,000.)

Comment: Given this builds on work already being carried out, particularly in the environs of the Tai National Park, we would like to see some evidence of efficacy of these awareness raising investments.

With respect specifically to the illegal artisanal gold mining, it is our experience that awareness raising bears little fruit and unless significantly more attractive alternative livelihood opportunities exist, these activities will continue with or without awareness campaigns. Have awareness campaigns been good value for money in the TNP? There is a strong focus on seeking alternative livelihoods – can you set out clearly what makes this scheme different from past failures?

Response: With the support of local administrative authorities, OIPR established local committees for awareness raising, on the negative impacts of gold panning especially on people health. Through meetings held in local communities, key messages and images were used to illustrate the damage to human health from chemicals used for gold panning, dust from the sites, etc. proved successful as shown through a decrease in the number of gold panning sites both within and around the TNP. Site numbers went down after awareness raising activities from 126 in 2011 to a current count of 85. To support former gold panners, local



administrative authorities provided lands and OIPR financed seedlings, resulting in former illegal gold panners currently engaging in alternative activities to gold panning such as, vegetable gardening, agroforestry and reforestation with fruit trees meeting their need for both subsistence (food security) and income-generation.

The project seeks to build on these successes through scaled-up awareness raising to reach a wider number of community members through local radio to deter people from engaging in illegal gold panning. Abandoned gold panning sites in the PNT buffer zones will be restored for the development of income generating activities (e.g., agroforestry, vegetable gardening, lowlands rice culture) and targeted to women to both enhance food security and provide them with incomes given that they currently have little access to revenues from cash crops and other activities. OIPR has already conducted research with the help of GiZ, which confirms the absence of harmful chemicals and heavy metals in the abandoned gold panning lowlands. OIPR has also acquired a metalizer (heavy metals analyser) to further test the lowlands soil prior to launching agricultural or agroforestry activities.

Comment: Is there any intention to ensure synergies with the DGM across some of these activities (for example targeting the same geographical areas)?

Response: Yes, there will be synergies with the DGM. Both FIP and DGM target the same intervention areas.

Comment: Component 1

Can you clarify whether the local committees to be formed include representatives from multiple villages or single villages?

Response: Yes, local communities for GF co-management will include representatives from all villages adjacent to the Gazetted Forests.

Comment: Can you also clarify the number of participatory GF management plans envisaged as there seems to be some discrepancy between the number in the text (5) and the number in the results framework (4).

Response: Apologies - this was a mistake. The number of participatory GF management plans is 4. The discrepancy has been corrected in the revised PAD.

Comment: On the reforestation activities we note a centralised nursery approach to raising seedlings. Have alternative options been explored to work with private sector suppliers and/or existing nurseries closer to the reforestation sites? Generation of seedlings could be part of the livelihood initiatives and incentive system?

Response: Point well taken. Nurseries to raise seedlings will be extended to private sector suppliers, existing nurseries and/or to organize communities to develop nurseries and supply seedlings as part of livelihood activities and incentive mechanisms. Implementation manual under preparation will be further detailed so that these avenues will be fully explored.

Comment: On the activities to support zero deforestation agriculture, could you provide a little more information on the "cocoa industry"? Given the recent joint framework for action on cocoa and forest announced in COP 23, will the project team explore opportunities to link with the "cocoa industry" that has signed up?

Response: Yes, the project will work closely with the cocoa industry. Partners in the industry, which have already been identified, are Mondelez, CEMOI and Barry Callebaut. Furthermore, the new Forest Sector Policy, which was specifically developed to be in line with the joint framework for action on cocoa, is being piloted under the Project.

Comment: Whilst we appreciate the opportunity to support organized returns of migrants back to the central belt, we still have some reservations about the relative cost-benefit of the voluntary migration component. The target is to support 100 families. Is this part of a broader strategy with full government financial support? It strikes us as potentially an expensive pilot if this does not have a realistic prospect of sustained and strategic support including provisions for basic services for the returnees for example. We would appreciate more information on this.

Response: Thank you for raising this. Further discussions on this activity were conducted with the Government, which is highly committed to this initiative. The target is now 1000 instead of 100 (updated in the results framework). Furthermore, the WB is open to providing additional financing to the project in the medium term. This was discussed during the decision meeting and reported in the Decision note.

The World Bank and ADB will work in close collaboration for the success of this return initiative -- the WB project will work to identify potential voluntary returnees in the South West and support them with the development of reforestation, agroforestry, and vegetable gardening income-generating activities in the Center; the ADB project will support: (i) development of basic community infrastructures to accommodate potential returnees; (ii) the development of high potential crops and tree species value chains; (iii) support for land tenure; and (iv) capacity building in agricultural and agroforestry intensification and in techniques to increase productivity of newly created farms.



Comment: Component 2

See question above about surveillance A relatively modest sum of \$1 million is provided for enhancing livelihoods of communities around the Tai national park. The proposal states that the scale of the challenge is significant. Can you provide some information on how you intend to get the best value from these efforts.

Response: In addition to the \$1 million allocated to enhancing livelihoods, the TNP communities will also benefit from DGM financing (US\$4.5 million). As indicated above, income-generating activities will be focused on vegetable gardening, agro-forestry, reforestation and rice culture in the rehabilitated non-contaminated abandoned gold panning sites. These activities are not costly and the budget allocated will make a significant difference for livelihood enhancement in targeted communities, e.g., \$1 million corresponds to 500 million CFA Francs while minimum wage in RCI is FCFA 60,000.

Comment: Risks

Thank you for a thorough risk assessment and clear mitigation plans particularly around financial risk. under social risks – has social analysis picked up any potential exclusion issues associated with the different nationalities/ethnicities of migrants – for example in committee structures?

Response: Many thanks for raising this important issue, especially in the context of RCI where different nationalities live in and around the GFs. The social assessment did not raise any exclusion issues. The project will closely monitor any potential exclusion related to ethnicities and will ensure balanced representation for all committees. The implementation manual will also provide guidelines for monitoring any potential exclusion issues and strategy to mitigate them.

Response 2 Gaia Allison United Kingdom

Thank you very much for the clarifications and answers to the UK's questions. On Dec 04, the basis of these responses, and the actions associated with them, we are happy to 2017 approve the proposal.