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: 10 November 2008 Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

Full size project GEF Trust Fund
GEF PROJECT ID: 3781
PROJECT DURATION: 5 YEARS
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:
COUNTRY(IES): Chad, Gambia, Mali, Sierra Leone, Togo
PROJECT TITLE: SPWA- Evolution of PA systems with regard to climatic, institutional, social, and economic conditions in the West Africa Region
GEF AGENCY (IES): UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): WCMC, Ministries of Environment and Natural resources & other partners.
GEF FOCAL AREA (S): Biodiversity
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SO #1, BD- SP-1, SP 2, and SP3:
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT : STRATEGIC PROGRAM FOR WEST AFRICA
PROJECT PROMOTES SOUND CHEMICAL MANAGEMENT (if applicable): yes ☐ no ☐

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 has provided comments to UNEP and the GEF-Sec on an earlier draft version of this PIF. This revised PIF is essentially unchanged except for changes in the budgetary requests from the GEF. Summarizing these previous comments, STAP notes that with the high vulnerability of countries involved in this program, a regional project focused on PA design in the face of climate change (including human adaptations to climate change that will affect biodiversity inside and outside PAs) is a desirable initiative. UNEP is the right agency to lead such an initiative. However, STAP has concerns that the project lacks focus and is trying to do too many things. STAP acknowledges, however, that most of component 2, which partially contributes to the sense of a scattered project approach, is being funded by other institutions. STAP also acknowledges that a project focused exclusively on helping policymakers and conservation practitioners in West Africa understand the implications of climate change for biodiversity in general and of using PAs as a tool for protecting biodiversity specifically might not appeal to the host countries.

3. The only additional comment that STAP has relates to the component that produces maps related to placement of new protected areas, the proponents should be aware that recent work on targeting of PA sites has emphasized threat[1] and costs[2]. Threat refers to the level and probability of degradation that the area protected would have experienced in the absence of protection over a relevant time horizon. Costs include the foregone opportunities from protecting land instead of exploiting it (a measure of economic costs and a proxy for potential political conflict). What typically happens in protected area assignment is either low proximate threat land is protected or very costly-to-protect land is protected, whereas

[1] See Margules and Pressey, *Nature* **405**, 243-253 (11 May 2000), available at http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v405/n6783/full/405243a0.html, and more recent work by same authors and others, such as Hugh Possingham.
[2] See Naidoo et al. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **Volume 21**, Issue 12, December 2006, Pages 681-687, abstract available at http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=ArticleURL&_udi=B6VJ1-4M4CMS2-1&_user=10&_rdoc=1&_fmt=&_orig=search&_sort=d&view=c&_version=1&_urlVersion=0&_userid=10&md5=3cdd5f9a1d105024323090a0a085e2df

environmental gains per unit of investment could have been higher if costs had been considered in the targeting (which is essentially an investment decision).

STAP advisory response	*Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed*
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: (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.