



REPORT OF

THE CONSULTATION WORKSHOP

**on the joint AU-EU study to evaluate
the scope and pre-feasibility of the
Great Green Wall for the Sahara and the
Sahel Initiative**

**organised by the European Commission and the African
Union Commission**

Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

6-7 May 2009

CONTENT

ACRONYMS	3
1. OPENING SESSION.....	4
2. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY BY THE EUROPEAN UNION.....	5
3. PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE GGWSSI PRE-FEASIBILITY STUDY AND DISCUSSIONS	6
4. OUTPUT OF WORK GROUPS	9
4.1. INSTITUTIONAL ORGANIZATION AND FINANCIAL MODALITIES.....	9
4.2. TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY	10
5. PRESENTATIONS OF EXPERIENCES AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	15
6. FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	19
7. ANNEXES.....	21

ACRONYMS

AfBD	African Bank of Development
ACP	African, Caribbean and Pacific countries
AMCEN	African Ministerial Conference on the Environment
AMESD	<i>African Monitoring of Environment for Sustainable Development /</i> Programme de Surveillance de l'Environnement en Afrique pour le développement durable
ANAFE	African Network for Agroforestry Education
AUC	African Union Commission
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CC	Climate Change
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CEN-SAD	Community of Sahel-Saharan States
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CILSS	Comité Permanent Inter Etats de lutte contre la Sécheresse dans la Sahel
CSIF	Country SLM Investment Frameworks
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CSP-NIP	Country Strategy Paper – National Indicative Programme
EAC	East African Community
EAP	Environmental Action Plan (of NEPAD)
EC	European Commission
ECCAS	Economic Commission for Central African States
ECOWAS	Economic Community Of West African States
EDF	European Development Fund
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization (of the United Nations)
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GGWSSI	Great Green Wall for the Sahara and Sahel Initiative
GM	Global Mechanism
ICPAC	IGAD Climate Prediction and Applications Centre
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development in Eastern Africa
MS	Member States
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NWFP	non-wood forest products
OSS	Observatoire du Sahara et du Sahel
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
REC	Regional Economic Communities
SLM	sustainable land management
SLWM	sustainable land and water management
TFP	Technical and Financial Partners
UMA	<i>Union du Maghreb Arabe / Arab Maghreb Union</i>
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WAEMU	West African Economic and Monetary Union
WB	World Bank

The AU-EU partnership on climate change and a recommendation made by the first consultation meeting on the Great Green Wall in January 2008 in Brussels, acknowledged the need for a feasibility analysis or a pre-feasibility study on the GGWSSI as a prerequisite in order to provide AU, AUC, EU and EC decision-makers with sufficient information to identify the initial GGWSSI priority activities to be supported in the context of the strategic partnership Action Plan (2008-2010), partnership no. 6 (Action 2). The AUC confirmed its agreement to the proposed content of such a study in its letter to the EC dated 29 September 2008. The terms of reference are given in Annex 1 to this report.

The GGWSSI is a complex and ambitious concept that interacts with regional and international issues. A pre-feasibility study would be useful to analyze the coherence of the complex institutional, economic, political and financial architecture of the GGWSSI with the international context while reinforcing Euro-African relations. It would, ideally, improve policy coordination in the areas of the agriculture, energy, trade, and investment and thus ensure GGWSSI sustainability in broader terms and at the political level.

This was the background for the consultation workshop held on 6 and 7 May 2009 in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, to examine and validate the consultants' proposals on the institutional organization, the financial modalities and the technical activities for executing the GGWSSI (see Annex 1). The workshop was attended by national, sub-regional, regional and international GGWSSI partners (see List of Participants, Annex 2) whose many recommendations were very beneficial to the discussions.

1. OPENING SESSION

In his welcome address, the CILSS Executive Secretary expressed his gratitude to the Burkina authorities for hosting the workshop and to the Burkina Minister of Environment for providing the facilities to make the meeting a success. He also thanked the participants for coming. After recalling the very important stakes of desertification, he stressed that the Initiative was a source of great hope for the rural populations and that the original idea seemed unrealistic but gradually was turning into a reality. He spoke of the remarkable work done by AUC and CEN-SAD to achieve regional integration, the leading role played by CILSS and OSS, and the strong commitment of the participating countries that are establishing national committees. He praised the study and said that CILSS would use its experience fully to contribute to the execution of the GGWSSI.

His Excellency Salif Sawadogo, Minister of Environment of Burkina Faso opened the meeting by explaining the background of the GGWSSI. He emphasized that this Initiative had the great advantage of drawing on all the work done previously by the African countries prone to desertification. The GGWSSI, he said, can reverse the degradation curve and provide the stricken communities with the tools to manage their resources and benefit from the resources found in their arid zones. He spoke of the major procedural steps, from concept design to the adoption of the concept paper and the 2008-2010 action plan. He also spoke of the major role played by Senegal in the scientific development of the Initiative (choice of species, etc.) and the mobilization of African experts. He stressed that during the current workshop, it should be possible to validate the study and identify areas of synergy between GGWSSI and TerrAfrica, and that the Burkina Government would be very interested in the outcome. He declared the regional consultation workshop on the feasibility of the GGWSSI open and wished it full success.

Ambassador Amos Tincani, Head of Delegation of the European Commission in Burkina Faso, said that during the Second EU-Africa summit in 2007 in Lisbon, a priority action for partnership on climate change had been defined: "...cooperate to address land degradation and increasing aridity, and include the Great Green Wall for the Sahara and Sahel Initiative". He underlined that this unique initiative aims to be a catalyst in the

combat against desertification and poverty in the circum-Saharan desert regions and thus contribute to the Global Climate Change Alliance (launched by the EU in 2007). Ambassador Tincani spoke of the evolution of the tree plantation concept into an SLM approach that can contribute to the implementation of continent-wide plans and initiatives such as the NEPAD-CAADP and NEPAD-EAP, the environmental action plan... He pointed out that the EU support should target SLM as a tool for climate change adaptation that uses agriculture as a singularly powerful, basic instrument to promote sustainable development and contribute to poverty reduction and growth, as it is a source of economic activities, subsistence and environmental services. The adaptation strategies proposed in the GGWSSI study are relevant, but the feasibility of the various institutional scenarios and the financial requirements still need to be more closely examined. On this subject, mention should be made of the 10th EDF that has earmarked 20 million euros in intra-ACP funding for desertification control. Ambassador Tincani also suggested studying financial possibilities offered by the new national and regional indicative programmes and the thematic budgetary lines connected to rural development activities. He concluded that the GGWSSI should direct its actions mainly to promoting SLM and transforming the degraded ecosystems into healthy agro-eco-systems to improve the living conditions of the vulnerable rural populations.

Mr. Abebe, Director of the Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture of the AUC, brought best wishes from the AUC, especially the Rural Development Department and its Commissioner. He expressed his gratitude to the EU and thanked all the partners (CILSS, CEN-SAD, OSS) who contributed to the study. The choice of Ouagadougou as the venue for analyzing the feasibility of this African initiative is not coincidental. The AU and CEN-SAD/OSS, which developed two conceptual perspectives, worked together to harmonize their approaches and define a common action plan. He pointed out that the EU and AU had defined the GGWSSI as a priority action for the partnership established in Lisbon in 2007 and that the participants were requested to analyze the report and the institutional and financial proposals and then make recommendations. He ended by thanking the Government of Burkina Faso for hosting this workshop.

2. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY BY THE EUROPEAN UNION

Mr. Blok explained the background to the study, and the context in which the Africa-EU strategic partnership was established and then presented the terms of reference of the pre-feasibility study.

He reminded that the overall objective of the assignment is to assess the scope and feasibility of the Great Green Wall for the Sahara and Sahel Initiative, and possible EC/EU support. This includes a full update on the state of play of the GGWSSI, and comprehensive assessments and recommendations, in particular regarding institutional and financial issues, support for effective decentralized implementation, impact and sustainability of the identified activities.

The specific objectives of the study are the assessment of the main characteristics and institutional set-up, governance, potential initial partner countries and organizations, as well as synergy and links to other relevant initiatives. It will also identify possible sources of funding, in particular from the EU (EC and MS), and the best modalities to ensure efficient implementation and sound participatory approaches to help address the needs, capacities and potentials of the target groups.

He finally presented the tasks to be carried out that are divided in 4 major steps as outlined below:

- Step 1 Assess the level of progress of the GGWSSI, characterise and map relevant and existing related policies, programmes and activities at country and regional level, assess their relevance and degree of implementation, analyze overlaps and real synergies, assess the potential of the GGWSSI compared to other initiatives and on this basis identify strengths and weaknesses of past and current initiatives.
- Step 2 On the basis of the above mapping define strategic policy, and operational, institutional and technical orientations to consolidate and strengthen the actions developed in the vulnerable areas to combat desertification and to reduce poverty.
- Step 3 Based on the above develop realistic scenarios which promote synergies and optimal mobilization and utilization of resources which would otherwise be difficult for each country or region
- Step 4 Present, test and hopefully validate the scenarios at stakeholder meeting(s)

The complete terms of references are appended in Annex 1.

3. PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE GGWSSI PRE-FEASIBILITY STUDY AND DISCUSSIONS

Before presenting the results of the study, Mrs. Anne C. Woodfine introduced the team of consultants and thanked all the people who gave their support: Mr. Blok of the EU, Messrs. Abebe and Dampha of the AU, the European Delegations in the countries visited and the national, sub-regional and regional partners. For the final version of the report, she asked the partners to indicate any mistakes they found or any points that required more detail.

After briefly recalling the specific objectives of the study, the main issues and the background to GGWSSI, Mrs. Woodfine reported the results to the study that the consultants had carried out since the Brussels start-up meeting on 28 January 2009.

Mr. Abebe thanked Mrs. Woodfine for the excellent, detailed presentation and listed the key points in the study.

This was followed by remarks and general questions:

- the FAO representative emphasized the problems of having such a big coordination structure (see the 4 scenarios) and suggested that OSS provide technical assistance;
- the representative of Burkina Faso was pleased with the evolution of GGWSSI from tree plantation to SLM but stressed the need to appoint a national institution to take charge of implementing the Initiative at the national level;
- the representative of Senegal pointed to the need to link GGWSSI to forestry and not only focus on agriculture. From the institutional perspective, the scope of the Initiative would be too restricted if it only involved the Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
- the representative of UNCCD stressed the importance of focusing on SLM to combat desertification and suggested building on past experiences, bearing in mind their strengths and weaknesses. We should not focus only on NEPAD-CAADP and ignore the NEPAD environment plan. Furthermore, at the institutional level, insufficient attention has been given to the institutions that already exist. Concerning the initial countries, the question is whether it is necessary to start with a limited number of countries;

- the representative of Mali felt the report had not adequately capitalized progress in research, especially as concerns the selection of the best adapted species. He also gave his opinion on the technical and financial feasibility (which costs have been estimated and what contribution can be expected from the EU). Actions should be defined that accommodate specific country characteristics.
- the UNDP representative suggested that to ensure solid institutional roots, AMCEN should be invited to join the Initiative. He stressed the danger of developing too many activities that ultimately would be detrimental to the actions. He recommended focusing on one or two topics. This Initiative is a good opportunity to create the synergy needed, especially in the area of climate change. He also recommended finding an appropriate balance between capacity building and field actions;
- the representative of the Global Mechanism said that the entry point would be SLM with its social dimension, its search for synergy and its work with other initiatives. As for the actors, he suggested having the local communities play a leading role in the implementation work. At the financial level, approaches and strategies should be used to mobilize funding, and indirect sources of funding need to be identified. It is worthwhile developing decentralized cooperation.
- the representative of CILSS felt that the Initiative fit in well with the CCD and should rely on existing structures. As for the link between the CC and the CCD, the African countries and their partners are going to work on advocating the need to strengthen SLM and adapt it to the needs of CC;
- the representative of Niger supported the idea of avoiding the trap of focusing actions on forestry rather than on agriculture. The GGWSSI should have long-term perspectives but also have short-term actions with quick benefits for the local populations. He brought up the need to mobilize fresh funding and the need for the countries' commitments to be clearly visible;
- the representative of The Gambia said that the Initiative focused mainly on physical activities and that the services could also include ecotourism and the development of products with added value in order to generate more income;
- the representative of Chad reasserted the need for the ministers of environment to be involved in the steering committee. He said that it was not appropriate to speak of "initial countries" since all the countries should participate in the GGWSSI from the beginning. He suggested including Central Africa;
- the representative of Ethiopia said the Initiative provided an opportunity to integrate and coordinate forestry plantation activities using a SLM ecosystemic approach. He also mentioned the need for an institutional scenario that would function well at the regional and national levels;
- the representative of NEPAD regretted that there was no *modus operandi*. The links with the other initiatives of the NEPAD action plan were not mentioned in the presentation. He stressed that the CAADP also included revenue-generating activities such as agro-forestry;
- the representative of ACT said it was hard to see the links between the technical and the political aspects (except in scenario 4);
- the EU representative expected to see strong orientations in the pre-feasibility study, with indications of which actions other than forestry should be given high priority, e.g. agriculture. He suggested developing a bottom-to-top inter-sectoral approach based on subsidiarity. The study should spell out the steps in GGWSSI implementation.

Mr. Abebe gave a summary of the questions. Mr. Dampha pointed out that AUC and CEN-SAD knew which institutions are key to executing the GGWSSI and that an action plan had already been drawn up. The study should provide value added, i.e. round out this

information, identify shortcomings and propose institutional scenarios and appropriate financial modalities.

The representative of Nigeria mentioned the need to propose specific financial modalities for each country so that actions could be focused on specific national needs, e.g. agriculture, forestry.

The FAO representative said that originally he had suggested that the steering committee include representatives of the ministries of environment. Algeria rejected this proposal and suggested that each country decide on which ministry should be represented on the committee. The recommendation thus is that each country selects a lead ministry and an entry point. He stressed that GGWSSI should highlight SLM and contribute to poverty alleviation.

The AU spoke of its technical committees and suggested that the GWSSI steering committee could include the AU committees on agriculture, rural development, water and environment.

The consultants were asked to ensure that the GGWSSI pre-feasibility study would not contribute to an erroneous interpretation of the concept that would turn the Initiative into an agricultural project.

The choice of tree species was brought up several times. Some participants referred to the Dakar conference (February 2009) where the choice of tree species had already been discussed and approved. Nonetheless, technical guidelines could be suggested to optimize scientific knowledge. To apply the bottom-up approach will require discussion with the local population that, at the end of the day, should make the choice. Emphasis was also placed on the importance of optimizing the role of the livestock producers and on recognising the essential role of local governments in ensuring programme uptake.

Funding: direct sources should be identified for the first phase. At this stage very little funding is available. Thought was given to exploring opportunities for drawing on the "carbon" fund.

It was considered advisable to include ECCAS as a key partner. Chad is a member of ECCAS.

The idea of "first partner countries" was deemed inappropriate since all the countries want to participate in the GGWSSI from the beginning.

Following some discussion, Mrs. Sandrine Jauffret presented the terms of reference for the work groups whose brief will be to make a detailed analysis of the proposals on institutional aspects set out in the study (Annex 4).

Before adjourning and in order to ensure accurate understanding of the proposals set out in the study by clearing up some outstanding questions and proposals that are to be discussed in the work groups, Mrs. Woodfine gave more explanations, *inter alia*, on the pilot countries proposal that had been made in application of the terms of reference. As for the scenarios, the 4th option was proposed so that the workshop could examine the participation of selected international agencies and scientific/technical institutions whose role would be to provide, disseminate and optimize all the knowledge acquired. SLM activities include plantations but go much farther by including agroforestry, forestry, etc. They also contribute substantially to desertification control. Mrs. Woodfine suggested that the relevant scientific information, e.g. choice of best adapted species, be made available to the end users so that they could choose the most satisfactory options themselves. Mrs. Woodfine pointed out that the draft report included SLM practices such as sustainable agriculture, forestry, pastoralism. She agreed with the representative of Niger who recommended that GGWSSI undertake long-term activities. Ecotourism was considered appropriate for certain countries and could be developed.

4. OUTPUT OF WORK GROUPS

Two work groups were set up to analyze the proposals put forth in the study report. The terms of reference of the work groups are given in Annex 4 and the work group findings are presented in Annex 5.

4.1. INSTITUTIONAL ORGANIZATION AND FINANCIAL MODALITIES

The work groups were tasked with:

- making a SWOT (Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis of the four scenarios in order to validate the preferred scenario(s), and give reasons;
- discussing the roles and functions of the institutions at regional, sub-regional (if relevant) and at national/local (these will be country-specific) levels;
- discussing and proposing mechanisms to ensure financial support for the activities at the local level; these should be country-specific;
- considering the establishment of a GGWSSI donor platform, including either EU + EU MS or EU + EU MS + AU MS + AfDB + +
- examining plans to establish a "dedicated trust fund";
- discussing opportunities for the GGWSSI to catalyse SLM/REDD/C sequestration funds so that they reach the land users.

Institutional organization

Following the analysis of the scenarios, scenario 4 was rejected because it did not include the RECs in the institutional organization. Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 were analyzed in depth using the SWOT table (Annex 4).

The roles of the African Union and CEN-SAD are clear and well distinguished:

- The African Union's role is political coordination,
- CEN-SAD's role is technical coordination, using the RECs (WAEMU/UEMOA, ECOWAS, IGAD, UMA, ECCAS/CEEAC) to carry out activities at the sub-regional level. A secretariat would be hosted at CEN-SAD. It is essential to use what exists and to strengthen the resources of the participating institutions.

The participants agreed that in scenario 2 a distinction should be made between the role of the AU and the role of CEN-SAD where the GGWSSI coordination unit (secretariat) would be located and that the list of participating technical and scientific partners should be completed, (AU/SAFGRAD, OSS, CILSS, ICPAC, U.N agencies, CGIAR, etc.). There was also a request to include ECCAS, an economic organization in Central Africa. Chad is a member.

Financial modalities

The work group analyzed the financial terms and conditions at the local and national level.

Proposals for the local level:

- Develop the role of the civil society (organizations) in mobilizing resources;
- Strengthen the role of local communities in SLM;
- Mobilize financial resources from the local development plans and annual budgets of local communities;

- Involve the local-level private sector if possible, *inter alia* by introducing policies that benefit private investment in SLM, especially land tenure;
- Encourage local community involvement in paying for ecosystem services;
- Use revenue from forest management;
- Use revenue from ecotourism;
- Encourage decentralized cooperation;
- Facilitate access to micro-financing;
- Expand micro-financing to include investments in SLM;
- Encourage funding by persons who emigrated to developed countries.

Proposals for the national level:

- Encourage national financial institutions to invest in SLM;
- Vote for a national budget for GGWSSI;
- Bring out SLM/GGWSSI as a priority in negotiations with the TFPs (various strategic country support documents, (CSP-NIP, UNDAF, PRSP, CAS...));
- Obtain funding from new sources (CDM, Carbon fund, etc.);
- Promote private sector involvement;
- Establish a GGWSSI fund;
- Create a South-South partnership and investment platform especially for GGWSSI;
- Identify and facilitate access to appropriate U.N. sources and programmes;
- Seek funding from the AU and African sub-regional organizations;
- Use FARA and similar institutions to mobilize financial resources for research related to SLM activities;
- Seek funding from multilateral financial partners (banks, foundations, GEF5, intra-ACP EDF), and other EU instruments.

Discussions highlighted the role of the Global Mechanism in defining and establishing a platform to support the development of fund mobilization strategies in each country. A study that is currently being made will be analyzed together with the RECs in Tripoli in June, and the results will be reported at a meeting of ministers of environment, water resources and agriculture. Emphasis was also placed on the need to capitalize national platforms such as TerrAfrica.

The African Union underscored the role the Global Mechanism was expected to play in mobilizing funds and making "bankable" proposals. More attention should be given to funding sources linked to CDM.

4.2. TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY

The second work group (Annex 4) allowed the workshop to finetune plans for GGWSSI activities, *viz.*:

- political and legal issues;
- land tenure;
- communication strategy;
- local activities;
- optimization of SLM and strengthening links with ongoing activities;
- monitoring-evaluation mechanisms.

Connections with ongoing initiatives were largely discussed at the workshop on the identification of synergy between TerrAfrica, CAADP and GGWSSI, which was held on 4

and 5 May in Ouagadougou. Recommendations on incorporating GGWSSI in current regional frameworks and initiatives are presented in the following table.

Initiatives / programmes	TerrAfrica	Great Green Wall for Sahara and Sahel Initiative (GGWSSI)	CAADP Pillar 1	Complementary / Priority activities
Type	Partnership platform	Regional programme	African strategic framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GGWSSI implementation to be aligned with TerrAfrica programme approach and included in NEPAD's CAADP and EAP - GGW is an implementation programme for the UNCCD ten-year action plan
Thematic areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coalition building - Knowledge management - Investment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local development actions - Knowledge management - Investment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of technical reference and guidance documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Utilisation / enhancing achievements and mechanisms introduced by TerrAfrica in its three programmes
Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Executive Committee - Consultation Forum - Secretariat - Special Advisory Groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AU - CEN-SAD - Steering Committee - Technical Committee - National Committees - Monitoring-evaluation / impact monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AU - NEPAD-Sec't - REC (ECOWAS, COMESA, etc.) - Country - Monitoring-evaluation / impact monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Taking account of recommendations of expert groups - Communication between steering committees - Information sharing among the three programmes - Same Monitoring-Evaluation system as TerrAfrica

Sectors /	- Sustainable Land and Water Management (SLWM)	SLWM: - Agroforestry - Livestock - Environment - Sustainable water management - Improving living conditions	SLWM: - Land fertility management and conservation - Agricultural water use and irrigation - Land tenure policies - Livestock - Forestry - Improving living conditions	- Use, complete and revise documents/guides (policy, technical and financial documents) - Promotion of ecotourism
Scope	- Regional - Sub-regional - National - Local	- Regional - Sub-regional - National - Local	- Continental - Regional - National	- Extend the TerrAfrica programme approach to countries involved with GGWSSI but not yet covered by TerrAfrica
Intervention area	Sub-Saharan countries	Circum-Saharan countries	Continental	
Financing	(major) - GEF - WB - EU - Denmark - France - Other TerrAfrica partners	(targeted) - Member countries - FAO - EU - Bilateral partners at country level	- Member countries - WB - USAID - Denmark - FAO - GEF - Germany - EU - TerrAfrica - Bilateral partners at country level	- Special funds initiative for GGWSSI - Establish environment fund for Africa - Harmonise financing mechanisms of different programmes - Propose activities eligible for funding by climate change funds - PPP - Panel discussions - SWAP / Trust Fund

Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -United Nations organizations and institutions -International scientific and research institutions - Governments of Sub-Saharan African countries - National institutions - CSO - Research institutes - Private sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National institutions - CSO - Research institutes - Private sector - Decentralized structures - RECs - Regional organizations - Local communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RECs - Pillars institutions countries - Private Sector - Farmer organizations - CSO - Centres of Excellence - Research institutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Devolve responsibility to various partners for specific fields, depending on their comparative advantage to avoid duplication - Develop efficient communication strategies among partners
---------------------	--	--	---	--

The presentation of the Group 2 report was followed by the discussion summarised below.

The Executive Secretary of the ANAFE network said that no mention had been made of new innovative systems for training, research, and development.

The representative of Senegal said that there was no duplication with other past and current activities and referred to the emphasis that had been placed on the Dakar-to-Djibouti land belt where best practices should be applied. He also suggested that the GGWSSI include transboundary issues (there are conflicts in many of the countries in the zone) and that this 7,000 km land area be expanded to include Sudan, i.e. an additional 1,500 km.

Mr. Dampha felt that this Initiative should concentrate on the synergy and complementarity that could be obtained by working together, which would bring out strong political will. He also said that the AMESD project that focuses on building up the capacity at the national level to use remote sensing environmental information as a support tool for the decision-makers would soon be completed.

A long discussion was held on the institutional establishment of GGWSSI at the national level. Several participants insisted that existing institutions and organizations should be used rather than creating new ones. Each country will have to decide how it wants to organize itself and establish the Initiative at the national level. Since the national institutions and priorities are not the same, it did not seem appropriate to design a single system and impose it on the countries.

The representative of Senegal said that additional funding had been obtained since a special agency had been created in Senegal. This would not have been possible using the existing ones.

Last, the discussion turned to the importance of decentralization to the local level of government. The workshop agreed that local institutions should have a lead position in local-level activities. In many countries, the forestry services are the most highly centralized.

5. PRESENTATIONS OF EXPERIENCES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The participants shared their experiences and reported on progress in establishing the GGWSSI. Referring to achievements in each of the countries and lessons learned from past experience, they all expressed the hope that the Great Green Wall for the Sahara and Sahel Initiative would soon be implemented.

A summary of their statements follows herewith:

Nigeria

Following a description of the characteristics of the arid lands of Nigeria, the main problems were highlighted and efforts were mentioned which have been used to-date to address the problems. The main ones are arid zone afforestation and annual tree planting, under the Green Wall Programme for Nigeria.

Over the next 15 years, tree nurseries are to produce 420 million seedlings, and 300,000 ha (500x2km) are to be planted, including *Jatropha*, citrus, cashew, cactus neem, gum arabic etc (species will be chosen by local people).

The programme also includes promoting small / medium scale industries, settlements, ecotourism and capacity building.

The institutional arrangements include a national steering committee, state implementation committees and a national technical committee (with sub-committees

dealing with land degradation, finance, food security, C sequestration and public awareness).

Immediate concerns include the need for base-line studies, sensitization workshops, a donor conference and an international workshop.

Expectations of this workshop include funding, information, monitoring-and-evaluation and information about implementation.

Nigerian staff has visited Israel to learn lessons of the successes there in transforming the desert into a food production area.

Ethiopia

The diverse nature of the country and its importance as a centre of biodiversity were highlighted. The severity of land degradation from overgrazing, the expansion of agriculture into marginal lands and salinization were described. The country has many policies regarding agriculture-led development, the environment, planning at the lowest level and implementation of MEAs. There have been successes in SLM in the northern drylands of the country.

Ethiopia is keen to "join hands" in the GGWSSI to tackle environmental development, which will add to existing activities and provide welcome financial and technical assistance.

The Gambia

The country had a tree planting programme before the GGWSSI was proposed, addressing the many problems which high population density has created (agricultural expansion, bush and forest fires, overgrazing, infrastructure development, climate change and land degradation). Problems include land users developing *ad hoc* land use plans and limited resources (financial and material).

National efforts on SLM include a national institution working on land tenure and many policies designed to enhance SLM. The country has a national Agriculture and Natural Resources Working Group for effective land management.

Expectations for GGWSSI include capacity building for staff and communities and awareness raising.

Mali

The country started developing a programme to control desertification in 1985 (study funded by China) and a "green barrier" in 1987, focussing on the area between 16^o and 17^o parallels.

The country has followed the progress of the GGWSSI, validated all OSS studies, and participated in all the Dakar workshops.

Mali has reviewed the geographical area of intervention (100-400mm rainfall) but proposes to include the river area, which is very fragile.

The country is developing a national co-ordination and steering committee (headed by the Environment Department, but also including other sectors, e.g. Mines).

Burkina Faso

Green belt was launched in 1998 with a 5-year project, funded by development partners. It consists of a 2x630km band (i.e. 126,000 ha) across the north of the country, where

degraded land will be restored; other activities will include information dissemination, awareness raising and capacity building.

To-date 3,095ha have been restored in 56 areas. The project includes settling rural populations and reducing transhumance, with increased use of agro-silvo-pastoral systems.

The main difficulties highlighted (which have limited results) were:

- livestock grazing in the area where trees have been planted;
- harsh climatic conditions;
- land tenure;
- limited financial and material resources.

Lessons learned include:

- the need to use participatory approaches;
- the need to have watchmen to protect trees planted (as in pastoral areas);
- the need to involve local populations;
- land tenure (law currently being reviewed);
- the need to involve local government.

Algeria

proposed a programme which could meet all the concerns of the workshop since it:

- is in line with the aims of the GGWSSI and desertification control;
- would bring new jobs and reliable incomes to arid and semi-arid areas;
- would boost livestock production (milk and meat).

International companies would sign 15-20 year contracts to provide good income and also the possibility of generating electricity in the desert. This is a long-term opportunity, as trees live for 40-50 years, but brings short-term benefits, as trees yield after one year (this doubles in the second year).

One-third of the *Jatropha* could be refined to produce biodiesel leaving 2/3rds available for animal feed.

Senegal

Senegal views the GGW as a way to "recolonize and resettle populations by developing the value of the deserts" through agro-silvo-pastoralism, which includes protection of biodiversity.

The GGW will increase the incomes of the local people, improve animal and human health, stem the rural exodus and increase afforestation.

A band has been identified (based on rainfall) across Senegal for the GGW, although actions will not be limited to this band. The GGW will also target fossil valleys and retention basins, encouraging ecosystem management to reduce poverty and food insecurity.

The GGW is promoting micro-propagation of seedlings, use of NWFPs, promoting micro-enterprises, development of aquaculture and transport.

The GGW should not be a linear plantation – as this would disrupt local populations.

Chad

Environmental conditions in the country are challenging, resulting in problems regarding rural development and land degradation control. The government is implementing plans but these have so-far only achieved limited success due to various constraints, notably low levels of local ownership.

A 15km wide band has been identified for the GGWSSI, and there is already a Presidential Project to set up a green belt, which will be the start of work on the GGWSSI. A recent decentralization study has been undertaken to select 20 tree species for the GGWSSI, based on local conditions, species which increase soil fertility and also provide socio-economic benefits (NWFPs).

Activities will be co-ordinated by a national steering and technical committee, based in the Forestry Department – also regional committees. However, the initiative is to be inter-sectoral. A national document has been developed to support the initiative, and there are many relevant ongoing projects. The pilot project has planted 48ha with 30,000 trees.

The main aim is to control desertification, reduce land degradation and protect biodiversity. The private sector has begun to set up tree nurseries in N'Djamena.

Activities should involve the private sector and local communities, using participatory approaches including:

- promotion of fallow techniques;
- water harvesting;
- control of wild-fires;
- building of fire walls.

Institutional and legal issues should be focussed on in the future. In conclusion, Chad is supportive of the GGWSSI.

Niger

Three-fourths of Niger is desert, which suffers from serious problems of water and wind erosion.

In 1963, the country began developing green walls around Niamey, and other cities and villages. The country also has long experience in promoting assisted natural regeneration of trees – with spectacular results particularly in Zinder and Maradi.

A special Presidential Project is working to restore degraded plateaux, exemplifying the priority which Niger places on the rehabilitation of degraded lands.

The GGWSSI process is not well advanced, but the country was represented at the Dakar GGW meeting and established an Inter-Ministerial committee. Actions have been limited by funding. There is no single band of trees since activities are located on river basins, and are designed to protect agricultural lands and rangelands, and improve the livelihoods of the local people using participatory approaches (including the selection of tree species by the farmers and the development of woodlots around villages where the trees are needed). Activities have been decentralized to the regional government level, but are also carried out at the transboundary level (based on river basin).

The representative from Niger emphasized the widely-shared belief that countries need to allocate resources to the GGWSSI.

These presentations showed that certain elements are essential to the implementation of the GGWSSI at the national level, i.e.:

- establishing appropriate national institutional settings;

- recognising the long-term concept for GGWSSI implementation;
- harmonising national approaches;
- drawing lessons from past experiences, especially experiences with assisted natural regeneration which is the most realistic technique;
- allocating resources to GGWSSI at the national level.

6. FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

After the report on the main outputs of the workshop on institutional organization, financial modalities and technical activities, the following comments and recommendations were made:

- SAFGRAD suggested that the AU play a technical role in the GGWSSI by having its technical institutions provide support;
- WAEMU proposed that every person living in the circum-Saharan region contribute 1 CFA franc per day, which would be an enormous source of revenue;
- the ANAFE network was pleased that the draft report included the development of centres of excellence and training programmes, which had not been included at the Dakar meeting;
- Niger pointed out that GGWSSI had received high level political support and that the states should respond to this signal by establishing a start-up fund;
- CILSS stressed the importance for the technical institutions to aim at developing all the technical skills needed to implement the Initiative, and supported the idea of having the GGWSSI coordination secretariat based at CEN-SAD with technical support from the African institutions, which would oblige these institutions to be accountable. The relations between CILSS and ECOWAS were clarified; there is a convergence plan that binds ECOWAS to CILSS, (CILSS is the technical arm of ECOWAS).
- Mali recommended adoption of Option 2, with the inclusion of the African Union and CEN-SAD, but also with technical expertise from CILSS so that roles and responsibilities are not concentrated at the AU level.
- Senegal stressed that the role of the RECs in GGWSSI should be to solicit resources, but that this role cannot devolve to CILSS which is not allowed to collect funds. The GGWSSI should not be used to pay for the institutions, but the institutions should apply the GGWSSI.
- the World Bank was disappointed that the workshop had not identified a few priority actions. This view was supported by UNEP and the Global Mechanism which had hoped that the first post-workshop actions would have been identified.

Before closing the meeting, CEN-SAD informed the participants that a meeting of ministers of agriculture, environment and water resources would be held after the summit of Heads of State in June. This would be an opportunity to discuss the recommendations from the study and the results of the workshop.

Mr. Jozias Blok, representing the EC, said that the next step would be the presentation and discussion of the draft report and the workshop results at a meeting in Brussels on 20 May. The meeting will be attended by representatives of the various EC DGs and the member states. He stressed that the study fell under the Africa-EU partnership and that the 20 May meeting would be an opportunity for the member states and the EC to decide on how to contribute to the GGWSSI plans. He assured the participants and the REC representatives that they would all receive a copy of the minutes of that meeting and

hoped that each country would provide feedback to the ministers and to the local communities.

In conclusion, Mr. Blok thanked the participants for their contributions, analyses and expertise and said that the first workshop of TerrAfrica had added greatly to the consultation workshop on the GGWSSI prefeasibility study.

The closing speech was read by the representative of SAFGRAD, Mr. Youssoufou Mbengue, who, also on behalf of the African Union, thanked the participants for their informative contributions to the discussions. He also thanked CILSS for hosting the meeting which brought the GGWSSI one step closer to being implemented

ANNEXES

Annex 1

**Terms of Reference of the AU-EU study
to assess the scope and pre-feasibility of
the Great Green Wall for the Sahara and
Sahel Initiative**

1. BACKGROUND and RATIONALE

At the second EU-Africa Summit held in Lisbon in December 2007, the European Union and the African Union adopted the first Action Plan (2008-2010) for the implementation of the Africa-EU Strategic Partnership. The Action Plan is part of the Joint Africa-EU Strategy and contains under the Africa-EU Partnership (No.6) on Climate Change a priority action to "cooperate to address land degradation and increasing aridity, including the 'Green Wall for the Sahara Initiative'".

An initial consultation meeting on the Great Green Wall for the Sahara and Sahel Initiative (GGWSSI), organized by the European Commission, took place in Brussels on 29 January 2008 with the objective to start defining, more precisely, the contents of the partnership.

One of the main recommendations of the meeting was recognition of the need to merge the two existing draft implementation/action plans so far produced at the level of OSS/CEN-SAD and AUC¹. The meeting also concluded that it would be necessary to clarify aspects of the initiative not yet covered by the preparatory work so far carried out and agreed on the idea of a joint EC-AUC feasibility/scoping study on the GGWSSI.

Another recommendation was to consider the GGWSSI not as a separate programme or project but as a **federative platform**², which would help achieve sustainable development in the Sahara and Sahel zones more effectively and thus contribute to poverty reduction efforts.

As outlined in the above background, and in response to an exchange of letters between the AU Commissioner and the EC (DG Development), the joint study should be undertaken as soon as possible taking into account the lessons that can be drawn so far from past experiences and building on preparatory work already carried out by relevant organizations³.

As presented in the draft GGWSSI Action Plan adopted by a CEN-SAD Summit in June 2008 in Cotonou, the GGWSSI includes a number of clearly defined objectives and activities. However lessons learnt from past experiences and mistakes need to be built in the current proposed framework⁴. Local knowledge and skills need to be essential ingredients of the GGWSSI. Universal solutions and responses to land degradation and aridity, and with the potential to work across the region, do not seem to exist. Some success stories have, however, been reported with natural regeneration of vegetation on farmlands and widespread adoption of simple terraces for soil and water conservation, in

¹ Subsequently agreement was found in a meeting convened by CEN-SAD in Tripoli in May 2008 on a new draft harmonised Action Plan for the GGWSSI, which was submitted to the 16th Executive Council of the CEN-SAD in Cotonou, Benin (12–16 June 2008).

² Federative on a thematic point of view by, *inter alia*, promoting an integrated approach for interventions, (reforestation should not be separated from water management, and agriculture production should integrate land management and trade issues), mainstreaming climate change, biodiversity and desertification issues and obligations, mainstreaming cross-cutting issues (gender, conflict, environment, youth, etc.) Federative from an institutional point of view by, *inter alia*, bringing together different institutions and stakeholders at national level, allowing synergy to develop between regional or continental initiatives, and collecting and using expertise developed by regional/international Centres of Excellence.

³ the African Union Commission [AUC], the Sahara and Sahel Observatory [OSS], the Community of Sahel-Saharan States [CEN-SAD], the Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel [CILSS], UNCCD Secretariat, Global Mechanism, UNDP Drylands Centre, TerrAfrica, CAADP, the International Institute for Environment and Development [IIED], the European Commission and various Civil Society Organizations and countries (Member States of AU and EU)

⁴ A short historical context of the initiative, objectives and activities of GGWSSI is summarised in a background note in Annex 1 (more information can be found on <http://www.oss-online.org/pdf/imv-en.pdf>)

particular in the Sahelian zone of Niger and Burkina Faso⁵. Ownership and land tenure issues play a critical role in this respect. Furthermore this substantial proven body of expertise and activity can be drawn upon in addressing future challenges raised by climate change⁶. It is therefore necessary for all the stakeholders involved in the GGWSSI to understand not only what has failed in past interventions but also to identify and capitalize on the success stories.

Joint AU-EU scoping study

In the framework of the AU-EU partnership on climate change, and as a follow up to the abovementioned meeting in January in Brussels, the need for a feasibility or scoping study on the GGWSSI was agreed⁷ as a prerequisite to provide decision-makers in the AU, AUC, EU and the EC with sufficient information to identify initial priority activities of the GGWSSI to be supported in the context of the strategic partnership Action Plan 2008-2010, partnership no. 6 (Action 2)⁸. The AUC confirmed its agreement to the proposed content of such a study in its letter to the EC dated 29 September 2008.

The GGWSSI is a complex and ambitious concept that interacts with regional and international issues. A scoping study would be useful to analyze the coherence of the complex institutional, economical, political and financial architecture of the GGWSSI with the international context, while reinforcing European-African relationships. It would ideally improve policy coordination in the areas of agriculture, energy, trade, investments, etc, and thus ensure GGWSSI's sustainability in broader terms and at political level.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSIGNMENT

Global Objective

The overall objective of the assignment is to assess the scope and feasibility of the Great Green Wall for the Sahara and Sahel Initiative, also with regard to possible EC/EU support to identified activities of the initiative. This includes a full update on the state of play of the GGWSSI, and comprehensive assessments and recommendations, in

⁵ Journal of Arid Environments 63 (2005) 642–659 (www.elsevier.com/locate/jnlabr/yjare)
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6WH9-4G1MD9D-2&_user=586419&_rdoc=1&_fmt=&_orig=search&_sort=d&_view=c&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=586419&md5=dcf3b529a2ef94e241731d487840a0a0

Land Use Policy, Volume 25, Issue , July 2008, Pages 410-420

http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6VB0-4R71KMH-1&_user=586419&_origUdi=B6WH9-4G1MD9D-2&_fmt=high&_coverDate=07%2F31%2F2008&_rdoc=1&_orig=article&_acct=C000030062&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=586419&md5=af29b1550e8c1422a93f563ece7c1706

⁶ "Climate solutions need the local touch", viewpoint, C. Toulmin IIED, BBC News
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/7018440.stm>

⁷ See the minutes in Annex 1 "the meeting confirmed the strong political interest of African and European countries and organizations in the initiative and their intention to make swift progress advancing towards the implementation phase. It kicked off a process to clarify the aspects of the initiative not yet covered by the preparatory work so far carried out and agreed on the next initial steps to support the AU in this undertaking. The meeting participants fully supported the idea of a joint EU-AU feasibility study on the GGWSSI (to be supported through the EC Development Studies facility) to clarify a series of "black-spots" not yet covered by the preliminary (AUC and alia) work so far carried out."

⁸ <http://www.africa-eu-partnership.org/thematic.php?thematic=climate&PHPSESSID=a3e25956c864389e6dec83bee24e55be>

particular regarding institutional and financial issues, to support effective decentralized implementation, impact and sustainability of the identified activities.

Specific Objective

The study will assess the main characteristics and institutional set-up, governance, potential initial partner countries and organizations, and synergy and links to other relevant initiatives. It will also identify possible sources of funding, in particular from the EU (EC and MS), and best modalities to ensure efficient implementation and sound participatory approaches to help in addressing the needs, capacities and potentials of the target groups.

Tasks to be carried out

The tasks to be carried out are divided in 4 major steps as outlined below:

- Step 1 Assess the level of progress of the GGWSSI, characterise and map relevant and existing related policies, programmes and activities at country and regional level, assess their relevance and degree of implementation, analyze overlaps and real synergies, assess the potential of the GGWSSI compared to other initiatives and on this basis identify strengths and weaknesses of past and current initiatives.
- Step 2 On the basis of the above mapping, define strategic policy, operational, institutional and technical orientations to consolidate and strengthen the actions developed in the vulnerable areas to combat desertification and to reduce poverty.
- Step 3 Based on the above developed realistic scenarios, which promote synergy and optimal mobilization and utilization of resources which would otherwise be difficult for each country or region
- Step 4 Present, test and hopefully validate the scenarios at stakeholder meeting(s)

Under step 1 assessment and identification would include:

- (1) Identification, based on the materials so far produced by the various stakeholders (OSS, AUC, IIED, CEN-SAD, Global Mechanism of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification [UNCCD] etc), of the aspects not yet covered by the preliminary work already carried out on the GGWSSI;
- (2) Identification of drivers of success; assess their sustainability, assess their potential for scaling up including institutional, technical and financial requirements for doing so; Identification of relevant activities in the "GGWSSI" adapted to the national and regional context⁹;
- (3) Assessment of the significance of the initiative for closing the gap between national policies and planning processes (e.g. PRSP, NAP, NAPA, NRM Strategies, National Agriculture and Food Security Policies) and their effective implementation¹⁰

⁹ Specific questions that could be addressed here are: Why did well intended projects fail? [it should not only be about projects]. Why did others succeed? Identify the changes that induced farmers to invest in NRM, e.g. (i) greater farmer rights and responsibilities in managing resources; (ii) greater tenure security over trees and land; (iii) development of new technologies; (iv) increased knowledge of new technologies; (v) stronger skills for community management; (vi) greater access to appropriate technical assistance, etc. Draw on e.g. existing cost-benefit analyses, evaluations of research networks supporting related work in Africa, e.g. FARA, ADRC etc. including assessments of economic and social impacts for the poor.

¹⁰ SSA has seen numerous initiatives and action programmes to promote NRM. It seems that there is more of a lack of implementation than of policies and strategies. It is therefore important to analyze whether and how the GGWSSI does address the implementation gap. Does it have comparative advantages?

- (4) Clarification of possible linkages/ synergies and their transaction costs with existing and relevant international initiatives (e.g. TerrAfrica¹¹, LADA¹², UNDP/Country Pilot Partnerships, the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme/CAADP under NEPAD) and with relevant processes at the local level in order to avoid overlapping and duplication¹³, with considerations on scale and model.
- (5) Linkages between land degradation in the Sahel-Saharan Zone and global climate change effects. Existing evidence (from IPCC and other relevant sources) on current/predictable climate change effects. Implications for land degradation processes and for possible interventions to tackle them.

Steps 2 and 3 would include forward looking analytical work such as:

- (6) Provide a clear analysis of strategy options and justification for the recommended implementation strategy;
- (7) Provide a clear analysis of the different partner organizations' role and their institutional capacities and experiences. Identification of options/scenarios for the GGWSSI including concrete steps to support the GGWSSI implementation phase at country level, including consideration of the "subsidiarity" issue and added value at regional/continental level. Options for funding, funding sources and approaches need to consider existing and emerging programmatic approaches, embedded in national and regional planning, but particularly national and sub-national approaches;
- (8) Identification of the role of the numerous intervening stakeholders (more precise outline of what sort of contribution each of them would be bringing to the programme and the role that each one would be playing in the initiative) with emphasis on :
 - (a) how it is intended to involve local governments, farmers organizations and civil society in the GGWSSI. What type of governance and institutional set up to avoid building a top-down initiative? How to articulate the different levels: local, national, and regional? and
 - (b) Options to involve specialised national, regional research and CGIAR institutions and pilot activities before going into full-scale implementation.
- (9) Identification of key regional / transboundary activities that could be undertaken within the scope of the GGWSSI, including rangeland management and transboundary water and forest resources. In particular consider institutional aspects for any transboundary activities, and build on existing structures.
- (10) Options to ensure that African knowledge and scientific institutions will be the main actors for research and become centres for dryland knowledge in Africa, driven by demand, location specificity, local agendas and relevancy for users.

¹¹ <http://www.terrafrica.org/>

¹² <http://www.fao.org/ag/aql/agll/drylands/index.htm> and <http://www.fao.org/nr/lada/>

¹³ Specific questions that could be addressed here are: What are (national, regional) existing strategies, programmes and activities and how will GGWSSI build upon them (mainstream) e.g. to avoid overlap and duplication in order to benefit from synergy and complementarity? How to make the GGWSSI an activity that is embedded in national, regional and international policy and cooperation strategies, actors and relations.

- (11) Review of the overall link with the implementation of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) particularly as to the implementation of the recently agreed UNCCD reform (the "10 Years Strategic Plan and framework to enhance the implementation of the Convention"), assessing the so far insufficient integration of desertification-related interventions into development cooperation strategies.
- (12) Similarly, review the overall link with implementation in the identified GGWSSI areas of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and of the Convention on Biological Diversity particularly as to the necessary measures to facilitate adequate adaptation to climate change, cooperation in preparing for adaptation to the impacts of climate change; development and elaboration of appropriate and integrated plans for the protection and rehabilitation of areas affected by drought and desertification, as well as floods; Review, in particular, the linkages between the UNCCD and UNFCCC implementation and instruments (current and emerging)
- (13) Assessment of possible GGWSSI overall coordination means, financial needs and possible corresponding sources of funding¹⁴;
- (14) Analysis of assumptions/risks and measures to be taken to reduce the risks;
- (15) Highlight areas requiring further analysis and provide clear recommendations on next steps (including ToR for a feasibility/design study);
- (16) Identify possible preconditions for support from the EC and EU MS. If scope is positive in this regard, how could the EC and EU MS most effectively support the GGWSSI. Does it make more sense to intervene at the regional level or at the national level? What would be the prerequisites for integrating the GGWSSI in country assistance strategies?¹⁵ Analysis of EU MS /EC possibilities/willingness to provide support?

¹⁴ Specific questions that could be addressed here are: What will the institutional and organizational set-up look like? Will it be a separate, fully elaborated and centrally managed (parallel) structure? Or will GGWSSI make use of existing institutions and aim for management that is light but efficient and effective?

¹⁵ To what extent can funding and responses under GGWSSI be integrated into existing platforms at supra-national, national and sub-national levels? Addressing the challenges under wider forms of programmatic development assistance, linked to local-level responses, would be a departure from previous approaches and may be more likely to avoid some of the pitfalls of previous initiatives, e.g. in relation to CAADP/TerrAfrica, UNCCD/UNFCCC and national programmes of activities currently under the agriculture ministries.

Annex 2
Agenda

6 May 2009

Time	Subject	Speakers
08:00 – 08:15	Welcome	Prof Alhousseini Bretaudeau (Executive Secretary of CILSS)
08:15 – 09:00	Opening	Mr Salif Sawadago, Minister of Environment, Republic of Burkina Faso Mr Amos Tincani (European Union Delegation to Burkina Faso) Dr Abebe Haile-Gabriel (Ag Director of Rural Economy and Agriculture, African Union Commission)
09:00 – 09:30	Coffee Break	
09:30 -09:40	Introduction to the Study	Mr Jozias Blok (European Commission, DG DEV)
10:40 – 10:40	Presentation of Scope and Pre-feasibility Study Results followed by Discussion	Dr Anne Woodfine (Team Leader)
10:40 – 11:00	Constitution of the three work groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Institutional organization / linkages with ongoing initiatives – Financial modalities – Technical feasibility: initial partner countries, design study, activities and monitoring-evaluation <p>Explanation of ToR of the work groups / Choice of chairperson for each group, in charge of reporting work group results</p>	Dr Sandrine Jauffret
11 :00 – 12 :30	Work groups	All
12:30 – 14:00	Lunch	
14:00 – 16:00	Work groups	All
16:00 – 16:30	Coffee Break	
16:30	Close of the session	Mr Almami Dampha

[Preparation of Minutes of the Workshop (by team of Group Chairmen and Rapporteurs, led by Dr S. Jauffret)]

7 May 2009

Time	Subject	Speakers
09:00 – 10 :00	Presentations on Country Expectations	Country Representatives
10:00 – 11:00	Presentation of work group findings and recommendations	Chairmen of working groups
11:00 – 11:30	Coffee Break	
11:30 – 13:00	Discussion	All
13:00 – 14 :30	Lunch	
14 :30 – 15 :00	Presentation of Minutes of the Workshop	Dr Sandrine Jauffret
15:00 – 16:00	Discussion / Agreement / Validation of Minutes	Mr Almami Dampha
16:00	Closing session	Dr Mahama Ouedraogo Mr Jozias Blok CILSS

Annex 3

List of Participants

No.	Name	Country / Organization
01	Sandjima Dounia	Chad
02	Kebba N. Sonko	Gambia
03	Colonel Matar Cisse	Senegal
04	Lamine A. Mahaman	Niger
05	Azeez Fawusi	Nigeria
06	Berhanu Solomon Genet	Ethiopia
07	Colonel Moussa Ibrahim	Djibouti
08	Colonel Alassane MAIGA	Mali
09	Jozias Blok	EU
10	Wafa Essahli	CEN-SAD
11	Samba Harouna Thiam	UNEP
12	Dr. Emanuel Tambi	FARA
13	Dr. Kalinganire	ICRAF
14	Dr. Aissetou Drame Yaye	ICRAF
15	Boubacar Cisse	UNCCD
16	Foday Bojang	FAO
17	Reza Najid	FAO/LADA
18	Brahimi Youssef	Global Mechanism
19	Ines Chaalala	Global Mechanism
20	Anne Woodfine	Consultant
21	Sandrine Jauffret	Consultant
22	Dr. Abebe Haile-Gabriel	AU
23	Almami Dampha	AU
24	Joachim Ouedraogo	Burkina Faso
25	Edwige Botoni	CILSS
26	Taoufiq Bennouna	World Bank / TerrAfrica
27	Adama Doulkom	Burkina Faso
28	Mahalmoudou Hamadoun	CILSS
29	Youssoupha Mbengue	AU/SAFGRAD
30	Dr. Mahama Ouedraogo	AU/SAFGRAD
31	Djibo Ousmane	NEPAD/TerrAfrica
32	Hachimou Issaka	WAEMU
33	Amos Tincani	EU
34	Joseph Zongo	CT/CAB/MECV
35	Amadou Hebie	EU
36	Harouna Kindo	CILSS
37	Colette Zoetiyenga	DGACV
38	Dr. Patrice Djamen	ACT/SCOP, BF
39	Eloi Bonkougou	DCPM/MECV
40	Bruno Salo	DGCN/MECV
41	Kisito Nabie	DIGF/DGCN
42	Alfred Sawadogo	DRECV/Centre
43	Bassou Yaro	DGEF/Ouagadougou
44	Michel Tankouano	Focal Point/SP- CONEDD
45	Mohamed El Amine	Algeria
46	Bakir Bencherif Ougao Daoud	Algeria
47	Lamine Ouedraogo	DEP/MECV
48	J. Ismaël Tarama	APFNL / MECV

Annex 4

Work groups' terms of reference

Work Groups

Group Tasks: to analyze the study's proposals regarding:

1. Institutional Organization
2. Technical Feasibility
3. Financial Modalities

Each group should appoint a rapporteur and a chairperson; the chairperson will report the results and recommendations to the meeting tomorrow morning.

Each work group should analyze our proposals regarding:

GROUP 1:

Institutional Organization

1. SWOT analysis of the four scenarios
2. Validation of Preferred Scenario(s) – choose 1 or 2 from the four proposed, and give reasons
3. Discuss the roles and functioning of the institutions at regional / sub-regional (if relevant) also at national / local levels (these will be country-specific)

Financial Modalities

1. Discuss and propose workable mechanism(s) to ensure funding supports local level activities – these may have to be country-specific
2. Consider the setting-up of a GGWSSI Donor Platform including either EU + EU MS or EU + EU MS + AU MS + AfDB + +
3. Consider proposed establishment of a "Dedicated Trust Fund"
4. Discuss opportunities for the GGWSSI to catalyse CDM / REDD / C seq. reaching land users

GROUP 2

Technical Feasibility

1. Consider and prioritise proposed activities at local / national / transboundary also sub-regional or regional levels
2. Analyze the proposed linkages between the GGWSSI and ongoing initiatives – will the GGWSSI add value or duplicate existing activities?

Annex 5
Work Group Reports

GROUP 1: INSTITUTIONAL ORGANIZATION AND FINANCIAL MODALITIES

Chairperson: Youssef Brahimi (Global Mechanism)

Rapporteur: Laminou Attaou Mahamane

Participants: Burkina Faso, Chad, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Niger, CEN-SAD, UEMOA, ECOWAS, World Bank, UNEP

Institutional organization: SWOT analysis of the proposed scenarios

Option 1	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Takes into account the existing structures - Political and scientific anchorages - AU is at the top & provides political leverage - Reflects integration and favours synergies with the ongoing /existing programmes - Each sub-regional organization is responsible for one SRAP/CCD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Failure to take account of the WAEMU - Coordination role of CEN-SAD not clearly mentioned - Role of the technical partners of the UN systems - OSS positioning is not adequate - Role of African technical partners not reflected - ECCAS not included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential for advocacy at global scale - Promotion of South-South inter-regional cooperation 	-

Option 2	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specific Coordination Unit for the Great Green Wall 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Anchorage of unit (AU or CEN-SAD) is not clear - AU and CEN-SAD are on the same level - Technical partners of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possibility to mobilise specific resources for the Great Green Wall 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordination unit may duplicate existing structures - Fear of conflicts for leadership at highest

		UN system and African technical partners are not mentioned - Respective roles of AU and CEN-SAD are not defined - ECCAS not included		level
--	--	--	--	-------

Option 3	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direct relationship between the unit and the countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of the sub-regional organizations in the organigram - Unit does not benefit from expertise of sub-regional organizations and other technical institutions - Role of technical partner of the UN system and the African technical partners not reflected - Role of OSS etc. is unclear - AU, CEN-SAD at the same level - No definition of their roles - ECCAS not included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All the countries are at the same level of information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No ownership of the programme at sub-regional level - No attention to transboundary aspects - Coordination unit may duplicate existing structures - Fear of conflicts for leadership at highest level

Option 4	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Level of organization is unclear - ECCAS not included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -

Financial Modalities

Local level

- develop the role of the civil society (organizations) in mobilizing resources;
- recognise the essential role of local communities in SLM;
- local communities should mobilize financial resources through local development plans and annual budgets;
- the private sector should be involved at the local level on the condition that there is an adequate policy that benefits private investment in SLM, especially land tenure;
- encourage local community involvement in paying for ecosystem services;
- use revenue from forest management;
- use revenue from ecotourism;
- **Conditions: strengthen the decentralization process**
- encourage decentralized cooperation;
- facilitate access to micro-financing;
- expand micro-financing to include investments in SLM;
- encourage funding by emigrants to developed countries.

National level

- Encourage national financial institutions to invest in SLM;
- **Condition: justify the value of the investment**
- Vote for a national Green Wall budget
- **Condition: national priority granted to SLM, Green Wall incorporated in national economic development plan, Green Wall incorporated in NAP, labelling Green Wall under ongoing and new actions)**
- Bring out SLM/GGWSSI as a priority in negotiations with the FTPs (various strategic country support documents, CSP-NIP, UNDAF, PRSP, CAS...);
- Obtain funding from new sources (CDM, Carbon fund, etc.);
- Promote private sector involvement;
- **Condition: incentive policy for investments in SLM, label GW as eco-project**
- Establish a GGWSSI fund;
- Create a South-South partnership and investment platform especially for GGWSSI;
- Identify and facilitate access to appropriate U.N. sources and programmes;
- Seek funding from the AU and African sub-regional organizations;
- **Condition: mainstream the GW into the S/R programmes & the AU programme of work**
- Use FARA and similar institutions to mobilize financial resources for research related to SLM activities
- Seek funding from multilateral financial partners (banks, foundations, GEF5, intra-ACP EDF), and other EU instruments.

GROUP 2: TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY

Chairperson: Almani Dampha (AU)

Rapporteur: Edwige Botoni (CILSS)

Facilitator: Sandrine Jauffret

Participants: Algeria, Burkina Faso, The Gambia, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, FAO, UNCCD Secretariat, ANAFE

1. Political and juridical question

The GGW should:

- include the TerrAfrica platforms (where the TerrAfrica process is used) especially the Country SLM Investment Frameworks (CSIF)
- include national strategic frameworks (national forestry action plans, sectoral rural development programmes)
- be included in the NAP/CCP realignment process
- be taken into account during revision of the national environmental policies
- support the local development programmes on the basis of decentralized structures and the participation of local actors
- be taken into account when local development plans are updated to incorporate SLM activities and the GWSSI (local agreements, etc.)

2. Land tenure

- Promote harmonisation of land tenure regulations in the transboundary areas through GWSSI
- Analyze the land tenure situation in each country
- Include the GWSSI dimension in the land tenure policies
- Place state lands under concessions
- Include the gender issue
- Promote best practices

3. Communications strategy

- Analyze and evaluate what has been done in the field of communications
- Propose a communications and advocacy plan
 - Public and media
 - Facilitate information-sharing (website)
 - Create a framework for measuring impact at all levels
 - Mobilize stakeholders-donors + TFPs
- Develop local channels of communications e.g. rural radio, traditional channels
- Strategy for communicating research results to politicians/decision-makers
- Use existing facilities for consultations and coordination
- NICT: develop discussion forums
- STI: wealth of inherited knowledge (CILSS, SAFGRAD, to be shared)

4. Local activities

- Develop innovation systems: R&D + extension work
- Multidisciplinary teams
- Develop local medium- to long-term funding mechanisms (micro-credit)
- Develop income-generating activities (transformation, conservation, capitalization, ecotourism...)
- State support (subsidies, equipment, etc.)
- Capacity building for local actors + extension work services

5. Optimization of SLM and links with other ongoing activities

- Promotion of alternative energy activities
- All support actions
- Develop environmentally-friendly rural infrastructure

- Landscaping for urban areas
- Fight fires and other environmental risks
- Promote small water retention structures

6. Monitoring-evaluation mechanisms (regional, national, local)

UNCCD: impact indicators (at regional, national level) to be capitalized

Regional

- Reference state to be capitalized
- Capitalize TerrAfrica M&E systems
- Joint forum of stakeholders
- Environmental monitoring and information systems (AMESD + other systems)

Local

- Participatory monitoring-evaluation
- Joint forum for stakeholders