

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility
(Version 5)

STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: May 09, 2012

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Thomas Lovejoy
Consultant(s): Brian Huntley

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4827

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Kenya

PROJECT TITLE: Enhancing Wildlife Conservation in the Productive Southern Kenya Rangelands through a landscape approach Kenya

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Forestry & Wildlife, National Environment Management Authority, Kenya Wildlife Service and African Conservation Centre

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies): **Minor revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes this timely project intended to address the increasingly strained the relationship between conservation and development in the greater Amboseli ecosystem by rebalancing more equitably the rights, responsibilities and benefits of conservation and natural resource management, and moving from the protectionism and segregation approach to conservation towards better coexistence of people and nature. This project focuses on one of the great challenges of Protected Area management in Africa - that PAs were established under socio-economic-political conditions that were very different to the present, and biodiversity conservation programmes must adapt to these changes.

Some minor inconsistencies in the PIF need correction – such as the different project titles given in Part 1 Project Identification and in B Project Framework; differences in the number of visitors to Amboseli (200 000 or 130 000?), areas included (100 00 ha or 100 000 ha), etc.

The problem statement is clear and challenging: the human population of Kenya, (and no doubt the Amboseli Ecosystem) has increased five-fold since the 1940s; the traditionally nomadic Maasai pastoralists are becoming sedentary agriculturalists/pastoralists; problems are experienced through the presence of a migratory population of large mammals with the consequence that human/animal conflicts are affecting 64% of the human population; wildlife and the domestic livestock populations suffer up to 75% die-back in drought periods (2009); and that there are great inequalities in the distribution of benefits from wildlife conservation.

Three approaches and investments to addressing these challenges are proposed - improved inclusive governance through new policies and regulations (\$10 million); implementation of landscape level land-use plans (\$11 million); and identification and establishment of new protected areas (\$9 million). These seem appropriate to the problem. However, little information is given on the baselines against which the impact of these interventions will be measured.

In Project Development, detail should be provided on all baselines (social, economic, ecological, hydrological) that are available from the data-rich Amboseli Ecosystem, which as stated in the PIF, has enjoyed intense research activity for over three decades. The available information should also provide insights into the trends and dynamics of key drivers and responses, serving to guide planning and implementation of corrective actions.

Further information should be provided on how key interventions will be implemented and on the processes by which impacts of the interventions will be measured. Objective and quantified measures are needed relating to the achievement of goals such as 'farmers complying with biodiversity friendly farming practices reducing pressure from agriculture as evidenced by stabilization in agricultural fields, increases in volumes and duration of stream flows, no net loss of natural forest blocks in critical corridors' and 'PES for green water credits' and 'tax breaks'. Such objectives are appropriate, but too loosely stated and lacking in means of verification.

Value might be gained during Project Development through careful review of lessons learned in similar arid pastoral ecosystems of the Kaokoveld of Namibia, where community-based resource management systems and conservancies have a long history. The inclusion of traditional nomadic pastoralists into the eco-tourism service sector has challenges, and achieving equitable sharing of revenues in CBNRM projects such as CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe has faced serious obstacles, not least of which are the impacts of changing governance systems at global and local levels.

The Project Document should also provide more information on current PA management effectiveness using the METT, but increasing the sensitivity of METT measures for specific

A project of this nature requires considerable reforms to be instituted. Much coordination and indeed collaboration will also be required among the multitude of stakeholders. The risks associated with this not happening or being problematic could be reflected more in the risks table. The risk associated with climate change is considerable and while the adoption of a landscape approach to management is an adaptation strategy and buffer zone protection is presumed to militate climate risks, additional consideration should be provided to more specific means of mitigation and adaptation.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.
3. Major revision required	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.