

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: 7 October 2008

Screener: Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3760

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 3943

COUNTRY: Niger

PROJECT TITLE: Integrating the Sustainable Management of Faunal Corridors into Niger's Protected Area System

GEF AGENCY: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER: Ministre de l'Environnement et de la Lutte contre la Désertification, General Directorate for the Environment, Water and Forestry (DGEEF)

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM: SO1- SP3

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: GEF Programme in West Africa: Sub-component on Biodiversity

Full size project GEF Trust Fund

Integrating the Sustainable Management of Faunal Corridors into Niger's Protected Area System

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

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP welcomes investments to create a large and interconnecting network of protected areas (PA) in Niger's Saharan biome.
3. STAP was unsure as to what the project proponents meant by setting an expected outcome of "zero poaching incidents" in 10.9 million hectares of new faunal reserves. Such an outcome seems unreasonable to expect in the context of this project.
4. Although the use of protected areas to secure the environmental outcomes desired in this project is a reasonable approach, STAP is concerned that such areas will not relieve human pressures because they will be located in areas that are not threatened by human use. The PIF states that (p.5) "there is evidence that unregulated transhumance is putting pressure on biodiversity" and "the creation of faunal reserves and sanctuaries (e.g. the Aïr-Ténéré) has shown to partially alleviate this pressure." But then the PIF notes that "not only the Aïr-Ténéré reserve, but also the proposed Temit and, to some extent, the Tadress reserves are all in mountainous areas and away from the mainstream transhumance routes." This latter sentence would seem to contradict the first claim that reserves alleviate the human pressure. There is substantial evidence that protected areas are often located in areas that are not at high risk of degradation, hunting, or conversion to other uses (e.g., Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005; Green and Sussman 1990; Hunter and Yonzon 1993; Pressy 1995; Brandon et al. 1998; Cornell 2000; Scott et al. 2001; Sanchez-Azofeifa et al. 2003; Andam et al. 2008; Sims 2008). This bias in location is hypothesized to result from the politically contentious process of siting PAs, which often steers PAs to the areas where there is the least public resistance. Proponents should verify that their investments in reinforcing existing PAs and creating new ones will actually change human use patterns compared to what they would have been in the absence of the PAs.

<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.	<p>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:</p> <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 <p>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.</p>
3. Major revision required	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>