

**FINANCING THE GREAT GREEN WALL:
Indicative elements of the GW implementation cost**

1. Justification

The edification of the GGW is going to engender effects and impacts highly favourable to men and to the environment. It integrates, by its expected objectives and impacts, several mechanisms associated with development and environment. These are in particular: (i) the Sustainable Development Mechanism, (ii) the Poverty Alleviation Mechanism, (iii) the Ecological and Economic Migration Reduction Mechanism and finally the Clean Development Mechanism. The GGW also appears as a common heritage of mankind and a model for the integrated development of underprivileged zones which occupy ever-growing surface areas in Africa in general and in Sub-Saharan Africa in particular, as a result of desertification against which Africa must create a united front with a new vision and other weapons or disappear.

The Great Green Wall, designed as a 15-km wide greenery strip made up of plant species chosen according to specific criteria, and going from Dakar to Djibouti, is a CEN-SAD initiative, endorsed by the African Union. It fully comes within the plan of action of NEPAD's environment component. Investing for the implementation of the GGW project is investing for Africa's development and for the world's Clean Development Mechanism. **In fact, the non negligible contribution of the GGW to the sequestering of carbon** deserves special attention. With an average productivity of 1T Carbon/Ha/year, the GGW is eventually going to generate an annual biomass of 1Tx (7000 x 15) x 100, or **10, 500, 000 T Carbon/year** , **likely to make available** a large number of Units for the Certified Reduction of Emissions (UCRE), that can be used by the industrialized countries to abide by their own emission reduction commitments and indicatively representing "carbon" revenues in the order of **56, 700, 000, 000 Fcfa/year**, or **126, 000, 000 US dollars/year**, at the price of \$US 12 a T.

2- Indicative elements of the GGW implementation cost

The implementation of the Great Green Wall will be done through a Great Green Wall Project Paper (GGW/PP), drawn up on the basis of a conceptual blueprint (draft paper) and a conceptual note already studied and adopted by the Conference of Ministers in charge of Environment held in Dakar on 27 March 2006.

Within the framework of the design of the GGW/PP, different basic studies will be needed. The Terms of Reference (TORs) were studied and adopted during the conference of ministers held on 1 February 2008 in Dakar.

The indicative elements of the cost of the implementation of the Great Green Wall also focus on the financing of the studies needed for the design and adoption of the

Project Paper, as well as the main activities related to the edification of the Great Green Wall, namely:

- (i) Agro forestry
- (ii) retention ponds and hydraulic works networks,
- (iii) soil conservation and pedological monitoring,
- (iv) micro construction works,
- (v) coordination and monitoring,
- (vi) environmental monitoring,

The indicative costs are given on the basis of the average per country (11 countries crossed by the GGW) and a 7-year follow-up period. The following components are concerned:

Preliminary Studies Component (for the design of the Project paper):

This rubric includes the studies required to establish the reference situation, the equipment needed for pilot trials and the different meetings of information and/or validation of the study reports.

On the basis of the TORs adopted, the duration of the mandate is 1 year and an average cost of 100 million FCFA is provided for per country.

$100,000,000 \text{ Fcfa} \times 11 \text{ (countries)}$	$= 1,100,000,000 \text{ Fcfa}$
	or 2,219,000 \$US

Agro Forestry Component:

This component focuses on the putting in place of production systems with the overall protection mechanism. But it also includes all communication, training and sensitization costs.

$430,000 \text{ Fcfa/Ha} \times 7000 \times 15 \times 100$	$= 4,515,000,000,000 \text{ Fcfa}$
	10,750,000,000 \$US

Retention ponds and other hydraulic works component

In arid zones, non availability of water in required quantity and quality is one of the limiting factors. The scarcity of surface water resources will also be further reduced by the putting in place of retention ponds and/or hydraulic works networks. With an average of 80 retention ponds per country, 880 retention ponds are provided for in the GGW project. At the rate of 70,000,000 Fcfa / per pond, the cost of this component stands at.

$880 \times 70,000,000 \text{ Fcfa}$	$= 61,600,000,000 \text{ Fcfa}$
	146,667,000 \$US

Soil conservation and pedological monitoring component

The soil conservation and monitoring component has two sub-components:

- the establishment of the reference state and potential aptitude cards:

= 393,750, 000, 000 Fcfa

- the pedological monitoring = 131,250, 000, 000 Fcfa

Or in total	= 525, 000, 000, 000 Fcfa or 1,250,000,000 \$US
--------------------	--

Micro-construction works component

The success of the recolonisation of Africa's arid and semi-arid zones will be largely dependent on the decline of poverty in the rural areas by improving incomes through income-generating activities and access to domestic needs and basic social infrastructure (health, education etc.). The Great Wall, by its objectives and the expected effects and impacts, offers a conducive environment. To this end, micro-construction works will be developed thanks to the putting in place of a revolving support fund to back up and develop income-generating activities (IGA) and make for the creation of basic infrastructure.

for :500, 000, 000 FCfa x 11 x 7	= 38, 500, 000, 000 Fcfa
or 91,667,000 \$US	

Costs of management and monitoring/evaluation structures

These are the operating and equipment costs of the following structures:

- **The Pan African Agency of the Great Green Wall** assuring regional coordination,
- **Sub-regional Coordination Units (SRCU)** are 2 in number, to ensure coordination and monitoring in the two (02) regional components defined as: **West** (Senegal, Mauritania, Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger and Nigeria) and **East** (Chad, Sudan, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Djibouti),
- **National Coordination Units (NCU)** in each of the 11 countries.

Coordination structures should operate during the first minimal phase of 7 years to integrate the reality of the GGW in the Sahelian ecosystems but also in the collective conscience of African populations and institutions.

The indicative costs are given on the table below:

Structures	Operation	Equipments
Pan African Agency GGW		150,000,000 x 2 times = 300,000,000 Fcfa (years 1 and 5)
SRCU	180,000,000/year x 7 x 2 = 2,520,000,000 Fcfa	120,000,000 x 2 x 2 = 480,000,000 Fcfa (years 1 and 5)
NCU	300,000,000 Fcfa x 7 x 11 = 23,100,000,000 Fcfa	80,000,000 x 2 x 11 = 1,760,000,000 Fcfa (years 1 and 5)
TOTAL	29,840,000,000 Fcfa or 71,048,000,	

Table1: Elements of coordination and monitoring /evaluation costs

Environmental monitoring component

This is about the monitoring of the GGW impact from the biophysical and socio-economic standpoints. On the basis of maps and surveys, environmental monitoring should bring to the implementation of the GGW the corrections needed for its eventual success.

70,000,000 Fcfa/country x 7years x 11 = **5,390,000,000 Fcfa**
or **12,833,000 \$US** (for the initial phase of 7 years)

The table 2 below recapitulates the estimated costs of indicative elements:

Items	Amount in Fcfa	Amount in \$US 1 US\$ = 450 FCFA	Sources of funding
Preliminary studies	1 ,100, 000, 000	2, 444, 444	Donors and State counterparties
Agro-Forester	4, 515 ,000, 000, 000	10, 033, 333, 333	National budgets Donors + MDP
Retention ponds and hydraulic works	61 ,600, 000, 000	136, 888, 889	National budgets Donors
Soil conservation and pedological monitoring	525, 000, 000, 000	1, 166 ,666, 667	Donors
Micro-construction works <i>For 7 years</i>	38, 500 ,000 ,000	85, 555, 556	Donors + PRSP
Management and monitoring-evaluation <i>For 7 years</i>	29, 840, 000, 000	66, 311, 111	National budgets Donors
Environmental monitoring <i>For 7 years</i>	5, 390, 000, 000	11, 977, 778	Donors

Table 2 : recapitulation of estimated costs of the indicative elements: