



United Nations Development Programme
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY



August 8, 2001

TO: Mr. Kenneth King
Assistant Chief Executive Officer
GEF Secretariat

Mr. Lars Vidaeus, Chief
Global Environment Division
World Bank

Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaif
GEF Executive Coordinator
UNEP, Nairobi, Kenya

FROM: Nick Brown
Officer-in-Charge

SUBJECT: BD/OP-1 – PDF B “COMMUNITY-BASED CONSERVATION OF BIODIVERSITY IN THE TRANSBORDER BUFFER ZONES OF THE W, ARLY AND PENDJARI PARKS”.

The above mentioned PDF B proposal has been recommended for a second round of reviews at the Bilateral Review Meeting of 18 September 2000. We are now submitting the above mentioned proposal for further review/comments and approval.

We would appreciate receiving your comments no later than 16 August 2001.

Thank you.

Cc: M. Niamir -Fuller, GEF

**Global Environment Facility
TOR AND BUDGET OF PDF-B PROPOSAL¹**

Countries : Benin, Burkina Faso, Niger

Focal Area : Biodiversity

Project Title : Community-based conservation of biodiversity in the transborder buffer zones of the W, Arly and Pendjari Parks.

Funding Requested : 467.130 US Dollars

Cofunding : 19.350 USD (Benin – in kind)
19.350 USD (Burkina-Faso – in kind)
19.350 USD (Niger – in kind)
62.000 USD (IUCN - in kind)
15.000 USD (UNDP)
135.050 USD

Total Budget: 602,180 US Dollars

Executing Agency : IUCN Regional Office for West Africa, on behalf of :
*Ministère de l'Environnement, de l'Habitat et de l'Urbanisme, Benin
*Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Eau, Burkina Faso
*Ministère de l'Hydraulique et de l'Environnement et le Conseil National pour l'Environnement et le Développement Durable, Niger

GEF Implementing Agency : UNDP

Block A Grant Awarded : no

PDF B Project duration : 10 months

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PDF-B ACTIVITIES BY COMPONENT

1. The main objective of the PDF-B project is to develop a ten year program for conserving the biodiversity and managing the natural resources within the WAP complex, its buffer zones and corridors, through the participation of the local communities and pastoralists, private operators and NGO's, and the three governments.
2. The basic methodology to be applied by the PDF B is a participatory process for consultation and project definition. All relevant public and private stakeholders active in the region will be informed and associated, in an open and transparent manner, to contribute to the definition of appropriate transborder procedures and institutional settings. Existing capacity and experience will be valued and human, material and financial resources mobilised. As the WAP-complex and buffer zones are in a transborder area, rules and regulations will not be similar neither compatible. The different approaches that exist in the three countries must be harmonized through concertation to generate integrated action. This will take time and can only be started under the PDF B project. A common track record will allow all three participating bodies, united in a scientific and technical steering committee, to be informed about progress made and to guide the overall process.

¹ The Concept Paper for this project was approved for Pipeline Entry by GEFSEC on 18 September 2000. The Concept Paper is attached as Annex 3.

The PDF B will have three operational components. The Activities under each component are listed in Annex 1.

Component 1 : Necessary data for the elaboration of the full project document are collected and analysed.

3. In this component, the necessary data for the elaboration of the full project document will be collected and analyzed, including knowledge on the conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of the natural resources in the WAP-complex, socio-economic and ecological conditions, global significance of the biodiversity present in the proposed sites and the threats and root causes of its decline. This component will also identify the project zones, and determine the baseline scenario in the project site and system boundary, and conduct the incremental cost analysis.

Component 2 : Elaboration of the Full Project Brief and Project Document

4. This component will establish a general outline for the management of the main zones within the WAP-complex, will define, in a participatory manner, an institutional and organisational framework for the project. It will also develop the approaches, outcomes and activities of the three main project phases (Logical Framework), define the regional information and monitoring system, as well as develop the monitoring and evaluation plan for the full project, including identification of benchmark indicators for each phase. This component will also conduct a participatory environmental impact assessment of the expected project, define the financing mechanisms for initiatives by the community and private organisations and prepare a programme for environmental communication and education. Finally, this component will develop a handbook with procedures and tools for the implementation of the project, that respects all UNDP and GEF procedures for administration and audit.

Component 3 : Stakeholder consultations, and financing plan for Phase 1 of the programme

5. This component will encourage the public and private research institutes, development organisations, as well as local councils, traditional authorities and rural organisations, commercial, service and industrial enterprises active in the WAP area, to participate in the project definition process. The component will also identify and sensitize the funding agencies to guarantee their adhesion to the project, and establish, negotiate and sign collaborative agreements with all departments, programmes and authorities concerned.

OUTPUTS OF THE PDF B

6. The main output of the PDF B process will be the GEF Full Project Brief and Document following GEF and UNDP requirements. However, important secondary products will be:
 - an environmental impact assessment
 - an institutional and organisational assessment
 - a socio-economic and ecological description of the project area
 - a data-base of existing sources of information and a gap analysis
 - first steps towards a regional body for concertation, monitoring and planning.

NATIONAL LEVEL SUPPORT

7. This PDF B request is made by the respective Ministries of the Environment of the three countries concerned. The letters from the GEF operational focal points from each country are attached. A national scoping workshop (of 2 to 3 days) has already been held in the three concerned states, through Government and UNDP contributions, and in-lieu of PDF A funds. The national contributions of Benin, Burkina Faso and Niger to the PDF B will consist of the salaries of officers and staff. State vehicles will be made available for missions in the field and government

buildings will be available for meetings with stakeholders and civil society organisations. IUCN will make available a member of its staff on a part-time basis, to act as a co-ordinator of all efforts made in the course of the execution of the PDF B.

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PDF B GRANT

8. The setting up of a transboundary effort will require regular consultation between the three countries both during the planning and the implementation stages. The PDF-B is a unique opportunity for the three countries involved to design jointly the necessary institutional and organisational tools to complement the existing national and local bodies for managing the biodiversity and natural resources.
9. As this is a regional effort, and will involve coordinated planning between three countries, in addition to extensive local level consultations, it is necessary to request additional funding beyond the \$350,000 normally approved for PDF Bs.

ITEMS TO BE FINANCED

10. The total GEF grant requested is \$467,130. Co-financing will be obtained from the three governments (in-kind) and IUCN and UNDP.

Component	GEF \$	#Govts \$	*Other \$	Total \$
1. Collect necessary data for Brief	113,850	14,550	23,500	151,850
2. Develop Brief and Project Document	330,600	6,500	31,800	368,950
3. Stakeholder consultation and financing plan	22,680	37,000	21,700	81,380
Grant total	467,130	58,050	77,000	602,180

Government contribution will consist of salaries, vehicles for field missions, offices for meetings.

*Other contributions will come from IUCN for the project coordinator (\$62,000); and from UNDP for national workshops and national consultations (\$5,000 from each Country Office).

EXPECTED DATE OF PREPARATION COMPLETION

11. The PDF B is expected to be approved August 2001, and operations are expected to be started at the latest by September 2001. Therefore, the PDF B is expected to be completed by July 2002, and the Brief is expected to be submitted to the GEF Council November 2002.

SPECIAL FEATURES

12. The involvement of the local population (farmers, pastoralists, local traders, women groups, among others) in the management of the resources in and around the Parks should not only lead to a better understanding of the conservation management and its national and international significance, it should ultimately lead to a concrete improvement of the local livelihoods. Efforts will be made to make the protected areas contribute to community development and the local economy, without compromising their conservation value. The sharing of benefits between Park management and local communities (e.g. allocation of ecotourism receipts) can reinforce the feeling of involvement and the respect for direct responsibility by the various parties.
13. Development and land use planning in the surrounding areas must be enhanced and the decentralised authorities reinforced in their capacity to plan for local and regional investments and revenue generating activities, taking into account the constraints and opportunities offered by the biodiversity to be conserved. This type of regional and local "co-management" is a new challenge for West Africa and therefore the project is expected to provide a replicable model.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE PDF B

14. IUCN-BRAO has been requested to submit this PDF B proposal to GEF on behalf of the following ministries and their departments in charge of managing the protected areas in each Country:
 - Ministry of Environment, Habitat and Urbanism, Benin;
 - Ministry of Environment and Water Resources, Burkina Faso; and
 - National Environment Council for Sustainable Development and Ministry of Environment and Combat Against Desertification, Niger.

15. The PDF B will be executed on behalf of the three governments by IUCN-BRAO (Regional Office in Burkina Faso) through Direct NGO Execution Arrangements with UNDP, and with the assistance of UNDP-Benin as there is no IUCN office in Benin. The three Ministries, UNDP-GEF and the three UNDP Country Offices will provide overall supervision of the PDF B process. During the PDF B the exact implementation arrangements for the Full project will be determined.

16. In addition to national steering committees (see Annex 3), the PDF B execution will be guided by a Regional Technical Steering Committee composed of the following members :
 - One representative of IUCN (Regional or National level)
 - One person nominated by UNDP-GEF
 - One representative of CENAGREF (Bénin)
 - One representative of DFPP (Niger)
 - One representative of the Direction de la Faune (Burkina Faso)
 - One representative of the Regional EU-funded project on the “W”
 - One representative of the Private Sector

The Terms of Reference of the Technical Steering Committee are to :

- Give technical advice to the coordinating unit.
- Give directions and suggest alternative options, when necessary.

ANNEX 1 : WORKPLAN

PDF B component	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Collect data for Brief										
1.1 Preliminary data analysis	XXX	XXX	XXX							
1.2 Identify project zones and set baseline			XXX	XXX						
1.3 Biodiversity assessment		XXX	XXX							
1.4 Incremental cost estimate					XXX	XXX	
2. Develop Brief and PRODOC										
2.1 General outline for the management of main zones in the WAP-complex			XXX	XXX				
2.2 Institutional and organisational framework for the project			XXX	XXX				
2.3 Strategic approach and LogFrame				XXX	XXX		
2.4 Environmental impact assessment								XXX		
2.5 Implementation handbook						XXX	
2.6 Financing mechanisms					XXX	XXX			
2.7 Environmental Educ. & Comm.					XXX	XXX				
2.8 Information system & evaluation plan							XXX	
2.9 Finalization of Brief and PRODOC										XXX
3. Stakeholder participation and financing plan										
3.1 Public and private organisations and institutions participate				XXX				
3.2 Local councils, traditional authorities and rural organisations participate actively				XXX				
3.3 Donor round table						XXX			
3.4 Agreements are signed										XXX

ANNEX 2 : Endorsement letters

Niamey, le 23 OCT. 2007

LETTRE DE SOUTIEN DU POINT FOCAL POLITIQUE DU GEF 4

Je soussigné **Sala Assane Amadou**, Président du CNEDD, point focal politique pour le GEF au Niger, agissant au nom de l'Etat Nigérien, atteste que le projet " Conservation à base communautaire de la Diversité Biologique dans les zones tampons transfrontalières du Parc du W, d'arly et de la Pendjari" répond à une des préoccupations du pays en matière de préservation de l'environnement pour un développement durable, mais aussi constitue un des priorités de notre stratégie et plan d'action en matière de diversité biologique

Par conséquent nous le recommandons pour le financement .

SALA ASSANE AMADOU


Directeur de Cabinet du Premier Ministre,
Président du CNEDD

LETTRE DE SOUTIEN DU POINT FOCAL OPERATIONNEL DU GEF 4

Je soussigné **El. Hadji Oumarou**, Secrétaire Général, point focal politique pour le GEF au Niger, agissant au nom de l'Etat Nigérien, atteste que le projet " Conservation à base communautaire de la Diversité Biologique dans les zones tampons transfrontalières du Parc du W, d'arly et de la Pendjari" répond à une des préoccupations du pays en matière de préservation de l'environnement pour un développement durable, mais aussi constitue un des priorités de notre stratégie et plan d'action en matière de diversité biologique

Par conséquent nous le recommandons pour le financement .

EL HADJI OUMAROU

SECRETARE GENERAL
Ministère du Plan



Reçu le 08.06/99
17 NOV. 1999

**MINISTRE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT
ET DE L'EAU**

CABINET DU MINISTRE

BURKINA FASO

Unité - Progrès - Justice

Ouagadougou, le 15 NOV. 1999

N° 99 - 008 /MEE/CTK

**MONSIEUR JEAN BAPTISTE
KAMBOU, CONSEILLER
TECHNIQUE ET POINT FOCAL
OPERATIONNEL FEM AU
BURKINA FASO**

Objet : Lettre d'endossement.

Réf. V.L 99/204/LSM/dm

A

**Monsieur le Chef de Mission de
l'Union Mondiale pour la Nature
(UICN) au Burkina Faso
OUAGADOUGOU**

Monsieur le Chef de Mission,

Comme suite à votre lettre ci-dessus citée en référence, j'ai l'honneur de vous communiquer nos commentaires et suggestions relatifs à la note conceptuelle du projet intitulé "Conservation et utilisation durables de la biodiversité par les communautés autour des aires de pâturage des Parcs du W, d'Arly et du Pendjari".

Au regard de la conformité de l'approche développée dans la note conceptuelle avec nos politiques et stratégies en matière de gestion des aires protégées, nous marquons notre agrément pour la poursuite du processus pour l'obtention du PDF-B auprès du FEM.

Il reste entendu que les commentaires et suggestions ci-joints pourront faire l'objet d'un examen ultérieur au moment de la mise en oeuvre du PDF-B.

Veuillez croire, Monsieur le Chef de Mission, à l'assurance de notre franche collaboration.

Ampliations :

- Point Focal FEM (PNUD-Ouaga)
- DFC.

Point Focal
FEM/Bu. Lina Faso
Jean Baptiste KAMBOU

*Pour R. TRINIO et
Versique Gerge*

REPUBLIQUE DU BENIN
MINISTRE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT DE L'HABITAT ET DE L'URBANISME
DIRECTION DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT
01 B.P. 2422 COTONOU BENIN TEL: 81 20 65 FAX: 81 50 81

N° 455 00FENPADB/MEHVAAP

COTONOU, LE 05 AOUT 2000

*n. TRINIO
001-240-250-
8682*

**LE DIRECTEUR DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT,
POINT FOCAL GEF-BENIN**

A

**MONSIEUR LE DIRECTEUR DU FONDS
POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT MONDIAL:**

COTONOU

OBJET : Lettre d'endossement pour le PDFB et pour le grand PROJET « de conservation à base communautaire de la biodiversité dans les zones tampons transfrontalières des parcs W. Arly et Pendjari ».

Monsieur,

Les aires protégées et les zones tampons contiguës des Parcs W, Arly et de Pendjari constituent encore les prestiges les plus éloquents des efforts de conservation de la Diversité Biologique des trois pays. Les nombreux efforts que le Bénin fournit pour essayer de protéger les aires protégées sur l'étendu de son territoire méritent d'être soutenus pour ne pas compromettre les acquis capitalisés après de longues années d'investissement.

En dépit de tous les efforts, les aires protégées continuent de subir les agressions des braconniers ainsi que la convulsion des populations à la recherche de terres fertiles pour leurs activités agricoles.

La pauvreté, la transhumance, les perturbations climatiques, les prélèvements sauvages et irrationnels et les tentatives d'occupation anarchiques auxquels vient s'ajouter l'insuffisance de la connaissance des fonctionnalités dans le tissu écologique complexe que constituent ces réserves et dont chaque élément est un important fil, sont encore des menaces sérieuses contre lesquelles il va falloir continuer de lutter.

Cette tâche permanente occupe une place de choix dans le programme d'Action de Gouvernement du Bénin et reste donc la priorité des mesures à prendre pour la protection de l'Environnement en général et la conservation de la Diversité Biologique en particulier.

Eu égard à tout ce qui précède, je soussigné GBAGUIDI Ludolphe, Directeur de l'Environnement et Point Focal du GEF au Bénin approuve les objectifs du « Projet Conservation à base Communautaire de la Biodiversité dans les zones tampons transfrontalières des Parcs du W, d'Arly et de la Pendjari et sollicite du Fonds pour l'Environnement Mondial (FEM), un appui financier pour sa réalisation.

Cet appui viendra renforcer les capacités de l'Etat béninois qui s'engage à aider à la mise en œuvre et à la durabilité de ce Projet.

La présente lettre d'endossement qui engage le Bénin reste valable aussi bien à l'étape de la formulation et de la mise en œuvre du PDFB qu'à celle du grand Projet lui-même.

Directeur de l'Environnement
Point Focal GEF-Bénin
[Signature]
GBAGUIDI A. Ludolphe

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

CONCEPT PAPER

1. **Project Title:** Community-based conservation of biodiversity in the transborder buffer zones of the W, Arly and Pendjari National Parks
2. **GEF Implementing Agency:** United Nations Development Programme
3. **Countries:** Benin, Burkina Faso, Niger
4. **GEF Focal Area:** Biodiversity
5. **Operational Programs :** OP 1 : Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystems and also relevant to the cross cutting theme of land degradation

6. COUNTRY DRIVENESS:

In conformity with the Convention on Biodiversity, each of the three countries has assessed its biodiversity and developed its National Strategy for Biodiversity Conservation (1998-2000 for Benin, 1997-1999 for Niger and Burkina Faso). In their respective National Strategies, each country has identified the W, Arly and Pendjari (WAP) Complex as a key component among national and regional priorities in the areas of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and they have determined that common action is called for in order to ensure the conservation of the WAP Complex, by means of the creation of transborder corridors. This request is made by the respective Ministries of the Environment of the three countries concerned. The letters from the GEF operational focal points from each country are available.

7. CONTEXT

A wealth of biological resources

The W, Arly and Pendjari (WAP) parks and their surrounding areas form a protected area complex covering some 5 million hectares. This complex extends over three countries (Benin, Burkina, and Niger) and comprises a series of national parks, preserves and hunting areas as indicated in Table 1 (Annex 1). The complex, whether in part or in its entirety, has been declared a Ramsar Site, a Biosphere Reserve and a World Heritage Natural Site, as shown in Table 2 (Annex 1).

The climate of the WAP Complex is of the Sahelian type in its northern part, with rainfall averaging 500 mm and of the Guineo-sudanian type in its southern part, with an average rainfall of 1,200 mm. The hydrographic system is relatively dense, consisting of semi-permanent to permanent ponds, numerous streams (Mékrou, Tapoa, Pendjo, Kountiagou, Goroubi, Bali-Bali, Pendjari, Arly, etc.) and the Niger River. Such a hydrographic system also makes the WAP Complex an important wetland area and accounts for the exceptionally rich habitats for water, land and bird fauna.

Due to the climatic diversity and the extensive hydrographic network, the WAP Complex contains an exceptional wealth of biodiversity, consisting of ecosystems, habitats, plant formations, and a great diversity of wild and domesticated animal and plant species and varieties or races. In the southern section (Pendjari Park), alluvial terraces contain woody species such as *Daniellia oliveri*, *Terminalia macroptera*, *Mitragina inermis*, *Anogeissus leiocarpus*, *Borassus aethiopicum*. Moving northwards, the vegetation becomes that of shrub and tree savanna with *Butyrospermum paradoxum*, *Entada africana*, *Piliostigma reticulata*, *Sclerocaria birrea*. In the northernmost section, in particular in the

Niger area of the complex, there appears a typically sahelian type of vegetation, such as *Acacia seyal*, *Acacia albida*, *Balanites aegyptiaca*, etc.

In the Park W, six types of plant formations are present:

- Gallery forest contain *Khaya senegalensis*, *Diospiros mespiliformis*, *Kigelia Africana*;
- Open woodland have *Anogeissus leiocarpus*, *Pterocarpus erinaceus* etc.;
- Tree savanna or savanna woodland have *Borassus aethiopum*, *Daniellia oliveri*, *Terminalia macroptera*, *Anogeissus leiocarpus*, *Butyrospermum paradoxum*, *Pterocarpus erinaceus*;
- Shrub savanna have *Mitragina inermis*, *Acacia sieberiana*, *Acacia seyal*, etc.;
- Herbaceous savanna are dominated by a grass cover (*Poaceae*, in plain grass savannas, and *Poaceae* in “bowe” savannas) ;
- Riparian forest are represented by *Cola laurifolia*, *Syzygium guineense*, *Morelia senegalensis*.

Over 544 species of woody and herbaceous plants have been identified in the WAP Complex. It provides shelter to some 500 sedentary and palearctic bird species, 150 reptile and amphibian species and over 100 fish species, some of which no longer exist outside of the protected areas. The Complex is of crucial importance to the last populations of sahelo-sudanian mammals. Over 70 species have been recorded, among which elephants, buffalo, koba, Buffon cobs, Defassa waterbucks, reed bucks, bonteboks (*Damaliscus*), bubales, giraffes, hippopotami, roan antelope, lions, cheetahs, and various monkeys (baboons, green monkeys and patas).

Agricultural diversity is also important with various races of cattle, sheep, goats, asses and horses. In the complex buffer zones, there is also a broad diversity of cultivated plant species (millet, sorghum, maize, fonio, cowpeas, peanuts, okra, sorrel, cucumber, calabash, other cucurbitaceae, etc.) and a diversity of cultivars adapted to the extreme production conditions of the Sahel. However, there has been no survey of the status of genetic resources in the complex, neither for cultivated species nor their wild relatives.

The rate of endemism remains unknown. The list of threatened species is given in Annexes 2 (a) and (b) for Niger and Burkina Faso. Among the threatened or already extinct mammals are the African wild dog, cheetah, black rhinoceros noir, Derby eland, giant pangolin (aardvark), common jackal, white-faced otter, spotted-neck otter, serval and caracal.

Main constraints and threats on biodiversity

There are many threats around and within the WAP Park Complex. They present some variations within the three countries and according to the geographic location. In addition, institutional and legal approaches also vary to a large extent between the three countries. However, all partners have agreed on the existence of a major problem which is the increasing pressure on biodiversity (both ecosystems and species) and on other natural resources (water and land in particular).

The main threats to biodiversity in the WAP Complex are:

1. Poaching;
2. Excessive gathering of wood and unregulated collection of other forest products;
3. Illegal occupation and farming of protected areas;
4. Reduction of pastoral land and expansion of crop production areas leading to overgrazing;
5. Uncontrolled and frequent bush fires;
6. Exploitation of water resources for industrial or agricultural purposes leading to aquifer degradation;
7. The potential air, water and land pollution by various chemicals related to agriculture (pesticides);
8. Mining projects (phosphate, gold) located in and around the parks.

The root causes of these threats were identified as :

- ✓ A high population pressure due to a high growth rate (over 3% annually) ;
- ✓ Increased seasonal or permanent migrations in and around the complex due to the fact that climate conditions are a little more favorable there than in other sahelian areas of the countries concerned;
- ✓ Poverty of the local populations;
- ✓ The accelerated progression of the agricultural front resulting from the introduction of industrial crops such as cotton.
- ✓ The lack of harmonization of policies and strategies in the areas of development and biodiversity conservation by the three countries;
- ✓ Insufficient knowledge on natural resources and their current conservation (or degradation) status;
- ✓ The lack of a warning system on biological resources which would allow taking appropriate measures to regulate animal population and/or protect and restore natural resources;
- ✓ The weak capacities of the institutions responsible for monitoring the complex;
- ✓ The low enforcement level and/or the deficiencies of the existing laws and regulations;
- ✓ The lack of involvement of the local population in park and biodiversity management (insufficient recognition of their rights, responsibilities, roles and lack of attention paid to their knowledge and know-how in NRM);
- ✓ The low level of awareness of the local population of the WAP Complex of the significance of its biodiversity at the national, regional and international levels;
- ✓ The diverging interpretations between the authorities and the populations concerning the rights of usufruct of the natural resources of the complex and its buffer zones, which may arise from the lack of knowledge of the legislation on the part of the population and/or the lack of consideration given to customary practices in land management;
- ✓ The insufficient recognition of the value of the biodiversity (of the ecosystems, species and genetic resources) of the Complex by national decision-makers;
- ✓ The lack of equity in the distribution of the benefits accruing from the complex (the population groups receive no short-term or direct benefits from the existence of these protected areas and are not informed of the potential long-term benefits).

Ongoing and planned support

The projects and programmes listed below are operational or being implemented in the WAP Park Complex area, and all are relevant to the objectives of this project.

Regional level initiatives include:

- The Regional Programme for W Park management, funded by the European Union,
- The management of natural resources in the buffer zones of W Park in Niger and in Benin (FAC and the Netherlands).
- Regional E7 Project for the development of the International W Park, by an international consortium under the direction of Electricité de France.

In Burkina Faso, the projects include:

- The local development project of Eastern Burkina Faso (ADELE) funded by the Swiss Cooperation Agency, with IUCN participation. This project is aimed at raising public

awareness regarding natural resource management, at supporting village eco-development initiatives and marking the boundaries of the protected areas.

- The Fauna participatory management project in the classified forest of Die Foula and Longonie, funded by GEF/World Bank;
- The assistance of the Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial (FFEM) protected areas in eastern Burkina Faso through the project supporting the Burkina Fauna Conservation Units.
- The funding of the European Union and Agence Française de Développement for the Arly National Park and Wildlife Reserves of Kourtiagou and Madjouari.
- A feasibility study for the construction of a dam on the Arly,
- In addition to these projects operating within the parks, various initiatives from public and private organizations are under way in the buffer zones of the WAP Complex.

In Benin, the projects include:

- Funding from the World Bank, GTZ and UNDP for the management of natural resources;
- Initiatives supported by several donors (Netherlands, Germany, France) in collaboration with GTZ and SNV and other national partners for the management of the W and Pendjari National Parks as well as the Atacora, Seri, Proga and Batia buffer zones.

In Niger, the projects include:

- The Kouré project for the sustainable management of natural resources, funded by FED and implemented by SNV;
- The Natural Resources Management Project, Say and Boboye components (funded by the World Bank)
- The Domestic Energy Project funded by DANIDA (Say and Torodi)
- The Natural Forest Development Project, funded by ADB
- Various initiatives from NGOs and public development services.

8. PROJECT RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES AND SUMMARY DESCRIPTION

General Objective

Development and implementation of an integrated regional management system for the WAP Complex of Benin, Burkina Faso and Niger, and its buffer zones and corridors through the participation of the local communities and pastoralists.

GEF Rationale

Located in the heart of Western Africa, the WAP Complex and its buffer zones are characterized by their significant biological diversity. The WAP Park Complex is a unique ecosystem in Western Africa and one of the last contiguous landscapes of viable populations of globally significant biodiversity in West Africa, which are also of national environmental, economic and cultural significance. This last aspect is reflected in the presence of numerous archeological sites, testifying to very ancient human presence and in the multitude of peoples and ethnic groups living in the inhabited areas of the complex.

And yet, the local populations of the protected areas of the WAP Complex are among the poorest in Western Africa. Their number is estimated slightly over one million inhabitants (over 20 people per square kilometer). The annual population growth rate exceeds 3%, due to the increased birth rate, decreased mortality rate and intense migration into those areas in search for new sedentary pastures and transhumance. The strong human influence in the buffer zones of the WAP Complex results today in ever increasing pressure on the parks. There is increasing competition for rangeland resources between sedentary and transhumant animal production, and the wild fauna.

The W Park was created in a no-man's land (kept as such since the 14th century), at a time (1926) when the sahelian livestock farmers (in the north) did not practice transhumance and when those of the Borgou (in the south) were few in numbers and sedentary. Today, the WAP Complex has become a preferred site for national and transborder transhumance. It should be noted that transhumance is a migratory strategy aimed at responding to the impoverishment of the sahelian rangelands due not only to higher animal population densities but also to the advance to the south of the agricultural and desertic front in the Sahel region.

Transhumance is one of the major social and environmental concerns for the survival of the WAP Complex. It is a source of recurring conflicts between crop farmers and animal farmers, and between the park authorities and the animal farmers, both at the national and transnational levels. It is a cause of the degradation of the faunal habitat in the grazing areas, and is a contributing factor to land degradation and erosion. And yet, experience elsewhere has shown that a well-regulated transhumance can contribute to biodiversity conservation in ecosystems adapted to grazing, as is the case in the WAP Complex.

In spite of the uniqueness of the WAP ecosystem, the various countries involved, i.e. Benin, Burkina Faso and Niger, have adopted strategies and programmes presenting contradictions, which are confusing to the populations established in the border areas.

Efforts are being made in the three countries to encourage the park managers to consult periodically and to exchange information on the pressures caused by the various actors on ecosystem resources. However, such efforts are insufficient due to: (a) the diverging strategies and approaches in effect in the countries as regards biodiversity conservation, (b) the weak capacity of the public and private actors to monitor and improve the park complex, and (c) the lack of attention given to buffer zones and corridors.

Baseline Scenario

Aware of the lack of sufficient coordination and harmonization of their actions within the WAP Park Complex, the governments of the 3 countries have requested and obtained the financial support of the European Union in order to strengthen the protection and monitoring system, raise population awareness regarding the sustainable use of natural resources, harmonize policies and conduct research activities. In addition, each of the three countries continue to ensure the day-to-day management of the WAP Complex protected areas through their regular budgets.

However, without the GEF alternative, inconsistent conservation measures are going to be applied in each of the protected areas, and there will be no integration nor coherent management of the resources in the interstitial zones of the protected area. This will lead unavoidably to habitat fragmentation, soil erosion followed by land degradation and loss of biodiversity. The pressure on biodiversity within the complex would continue to increase due in particular to illegal occupation and farming of the protected areas and the non-sustainable use of the village land resources in between these protected areas. These pressure, whose direct and indirect causes were listed above, will results in:

- ✓ The loss of habitat for the wetland avifauna;
- ✓ A reduction of the rangeland and pasture land for the wild fauna;
- ✓ Threats to habitat and ecosystem integrity (fragmentation of habitats, formation of degradation and desertification pockets);
- ✓ Increased vulnerability of spontaneous plant and animal species.

In the absence of the GEF Alternative, this situation will lead to the continued degradation of this park complex, unique to Western Africa, and which is classified as a world heritage asset; the extinction of species already on the red list of endangered species; a financial shortfall for the country and the local

populations; and the aggravation of social conflicts between the various actors within the same country and with those of neighboring countries.

GEF Alternative

In order to obtain durable effects and to generate benefits for global biodiversity and national concerns, the GEF Alternative will engage in the creation of a sub-regional system (between the 3 countries involved) for consultation, planning and coordination of all activities for biodiversity conservation within the WAP Complex (including the interventions of the private operators, NGOs and local communities), which will result in the creation of a system of protected areas interconnected by corridors, managed with the participation of the transhumant and local communities. The project will also create mechanisms for harmonization and management of conflicts between the various parties involved, including the sedentary livestock and crop farmers, the transhumant livestock farmers, and the protected area managers; and create a sub-regional system for environmental monitoring with the participation of the local communities.

Co-financing for this project will be provided essentially by the three countries involved and the European Union, for the improved management of the protected areas. The Regional Project funded by the EU, as well as several other initiatives localized in one of the three countries (DGIS – Netherlands; CFD – France, GTZ – Germany) will provide support to investment in basic infrastructure and management of the protected areas, integrated rural development in the buffer zones, and institutional capacity-building. GEF funding will support the creation of corridors, setting up a coherent coordination system and the participation of the local sedentary communities and transhumant populations in the management and sustainable use of biodiversity in the WAP Complex and their buffer zones.

Immediate Objectives of the Full project

The project is expected to be implemented in two phases over a ten year period. The PDF B will develop a set of appropriate benchmarks for each phase. Benchmarks for Phase 2 will be verified/finalized during Phase 1. The first phase consists of establishing coordination and conflict resolution mechanisms and incentives, including developing and testing models for community-based biodiversity conservation, co-management of protected areas, and land use planning. The second phase will consist of a “consolidation” phase, where the models developed in the first phase will be applied to all of the communities and resources in the WAP Complex and its buffer zones/corridors. The coordination/planning phase is expected to take 5 years, mainly because of the complexity of human/protected area interactions and the necessity for developing conflict resolutions and benefit sharing mechanisms in an orderly, participatory and peaceful manner. Without the second consolidation phase, interventions will not be of a viable size to make the necessary impact on biodiversity conservation in this important, last remaining, West African hot spot.

The immediate objectives of the full project will be finalized during the PDF B, but are expected to cover the following:

- a) National policies, programmes and projects for biodiversity conservation and natural resources management are harmonized and made consistent in the transborder buffer zones and reserves of the WAP Complex.
- b) Community and private organizations in the transborder buffer zones initiate and implement activities for biodiversity conservation and development and for the co-management of natural resources.
- c) A system for the management of pastoral lands and wetlands that overlap national borders is designed and implemented in the transborder buffer areas of the Complex.
- d) An environmental education programme is designed and implemented in the buffer zones of the WAP Complex.

- e) A regional, participatory mechanism for concertation, monitoring, coordination and information pertaining to the biodiversity of the Park Complex and its buffer zones is designed and implemented.

Expected Outputs

The outputs expected at end of the two phases can be depicted as:

- a) Critical and endangered biodiversity in the WAP Complex protected, conserved, and sustainably managed.
- b) A regional plan for the development and management of the biodiversity of the WAP Complex and its buffer zones in place and implemented.
- c) Legal and regulatory instruments pertaining to the protected areas, rural land property, the use and exploitation of biodiversity and natural resources harmonized and made consistent between the three countries involved.
- d) Political, administrative and technical decision-makers at the national and decentralized levels consulted regularly in order to harmonize their actions.
- e) Local, national or regional institutions, both public and private, involved in the conservation of the biodiversity of the complex and its buffer zones identified and analyzed from a legal, institutional and organizations standpoint.
- f) National and regional development policies, strategies and actions are analyzed regularly to determine their impacts on the conservation of biodiversity and the management of natural resources in the transborder buffer zones of the complex.
- g) Local community strategies and plans for biodiversity conservation and natural resource management developed and implemented.
- h) Programmes and projects for local development, promotion of tourism, conservation and management of natural resources, either community-based or private, elaborated and implemented in each country and in a concerted manner in the buffer transborder areas of the WAP Complex.
- i) Mechanisms to finance community and private initiatives for biodiversity conservation and natural resource management created.
- j) Participatory system for the monitoring and evaluation of local initiatives designed and implemented in the target areas
- k) Maps and analyses depicting the status of old and new corridors, range lands and pastoral enclaves used by transhumant animals as well as some special ecosystems overlapping national borders
- l) Regional management plan ensuring a balance between available pastoral resources and livestock load elaborated, implemented and monitored for the main pastoral lands and special ecosystems overlapping national borders
- m) Environmental education focussed on the WAP Park Complex introduced in the curriculum of the primary and secondary schools of the complex buffer zones
- n) Various socio-professional categories (fishermen, hunters, loggers, pastoralists, farmers, housewives, tourists and tourism professionals) using the complex biological resources are aware of and respect the importance of the WAP complex and its resources
- o) Studies and research results on the dynamics of the ecosystems and the key animal and plant species in the PAW Park Complex, as well as socio-economic analyses, actual or potential impacts of commercial and industrial investments on biodiversity, and dynamics of land use practices.
- p) A regional framework for the coordination and harmonization of the actions undertaken within the PAW Complex in place and sustained
- q) An integrated regional system for environmental monitoring and information for the PAW Park Complex and its buffer transborder zones created, including community-based monitoring and evaluation.

9. SUSTAINABILITY AND REPLICABILITY

The sustainability of the actions and impacts of the project after the GEF support and co-financing cease will be ensured by the sharing of benefits between Park Management and local communities (e.g. allocation of ecotourism receipts) and the assumption of responsibilities by the various parties concerned, in particular the local communities and transhumant populations, for the conservation and sustainable use of the resources in the buffer zones (e.g. bio-friendly activities generating revenue, sustainable harvesting, etc.). The economic potential resulting from the opening of the area, the interregional and transborder exchanges and the increasing development of quality tourism activities will increase the local communities' income, bring hard currency to the countries and strengthen subregional integration. All of these factors are essential elements contributing to both financial and social sustainability. The PDF B will conduct a rigorous sustainability analysis (including economic analysis of potential financial mechanisms) which will be included in the Full project proposal.

Although there are very few areas in Sahelian West Africa with similar transboundary global significance, the project will be replicable to other parts of Africa (especially East and South). This project will liaise with and exchange lessons with similar transboundary protected areas efforts in Africa, such as the pipeline Amboseli-Monduli project (GEF/UNDP/UNEP), the Kalahari Transboundary project (GEF/World Bank), and the Kruger-Gonarezhou National Parks (GEF/World Bank).

10. Country Eligibility

The three countries are all signatories of the Convention on Biological Diversity: Benin (1993), Burkina Faso (1993) and Niger (1995). The three countries receive support from UNDP and are eligible to receive support from the World Bank.

In addition, the W Park (Niger section) has already been declared by UNESCO as a Natural World Heritage Site and a Biosphere Reserve. It is also recognized as a Ramsar Site. The Pendjari National Park (Benin) is also registered as a Biosphere Reserve. At their Tapoa meeting of 24 April 2000, the Ministers in charge of environment of the three countries have agreed to initiate the procedures required to obtain the recognition of the whole Transborder W Complex simultaneously as a Biosphere Reserve, a Ramsar Site and a Natural World Heritage Site.

11. Stakeholder Involvement

This project was formulated by a multi-sectoral government-led Team in each country assigned as the Focal Point for the project. National Workshops have been held in each country using UNDP, Government and IUCN resources that have brought together these teams, donors, and other interested parties. During the implementation of the PDF-B project, the parties involved will be the government organizations in the areas contiguous to the WAP Complex protected zones, private sector industries such as ecotourism, etc., the local communities (both sedentary and transhumant) and their local development initiatives, the various donors and international NGOs. The PDF B will finalize the stakeholder involvement plan for the Full project.

12. Information on Project proponent

IUCN-BRAO has been requested to submit this proposal to GEF on behalf of the following ministries and their departments in charge of managing the protected areas in each Country:

- ✓ Ministry of Environment, Habitat and Urbanism, Benin;
- ✓ Ministry of Environment and Water Resources, Burkina Faso; and
- ✓ National Environment Council for Sustainable Development and Ministry of Environment and Combat Against Desertification, Niger.

The PDF B will be executed by the three governments with the assistance of IUCN and UNDP. During the PDF B the exact implementation arrangements for the Full project will be determined.

13. Financing Plan of Full Project

The GEF contribution to this long-term project is, for the moment, estimated to be not less than US\$ 5.3 million, over a ten-year period, which is equivalent to some 44% of the total cost of the project, estimated at a minimum of US\$ 11.9 million. The GEF contribution will be gradually decrease such that it is broken down roughly as follows: US\$350,000 for the PDF B; US \$3.5 million for Phase 1 and US\$1.35 million for Phase 2, i.e. respectively 86%, 50% and 30% of the total (GEF and co-financing). These funds will cover activities for policy harmonization and coordination, the creation of corridors, community-based biodiversity conservation, and identification of best practices and monitoring with the local communities. The exact GEF budget will be determined during the PDF B, after consultation with all co-financing donors.

Co-financing in the amount of approximately US\$6.7 million over a ten-year period is planned to cover non GEF activities, such as assistance to park management, local zone development and support to community sustainable agricultural production. These activities will be supported by funds expected from various sources, including the governments and local population (in kind), IUCN, UNDP, EU, DANIDA, and other donors.

The three countries decided to by-pass a PDF A because of resources available from UNDP and IUCN for this pre-planning phase. The PDF B grant is expected to be around US \$ 350,000 for 10 months, with additional co-financing from UICN for about US\$55,000 (in kind), UNDP US \$15, 000, and each of the three countries US\$19,350 (in kind). During the PDF B activities, stakeholders will be assembled to agree on the issues, options and consensual solutions. There will be a ZOPP planning exercise and a donor meeting during the PDF B process.

14. IA Coordination and Linkages to GEF and IA programmes and activities

The UNDP strategy in the three participating countries is centered on the fight against poverty. Local development initiatives will be strengthened by the project, whose implementation will provide an opportunity for the local communities to address the problems pertaining to their living conditions, ranging from health issues to the performance of their production systems. Thanks to the project, they will be able to negotiate for additional means to invest in their villages and to reinforce their knowledge and their negotiating capacities to a substantial extent.

From the very beginning of the PDF-B project activities, coordination will be ensured with the regional project supported by the EU and with several other initiatives undertaken in one of the three countries (DGIS – Netherlands; CFD – France, GTZ – Germany). Lessons learnt will be shared with other ongoing/pipeline projects in West Africa (e.g. Niger River Basin, biodiversity projects in the Niger Delta, Senegal Protected Areas, and Manda in Chad).

This proposal was originally submitted under a UNEP umbrella at a PDF A stage, under the title: “Community based wildlife conservation, land rehabilitation and carbon sink enhancement in pastoral areas of Benin, Burkina Faso and Niger”. Subsequently, GEFSEC requested UNDP to join efforts, and a decision was taken by UNDP and UNEP in May 1999 for UNDP to take the lead in developing this project idea. Discussions with GEF focal points and other government stakeholders since then have refined the project concept and resulted in the current formulation. UNEP took the decision in July 2000 to withdraw from this joint endeavor because they perceive little relevance to their land degradation portfolio. However, linkages will be maintained with the Joint UNDP/UNEP Land Degradation portfolio and lessons will be transferred, e.g. with the Desert Margins Programme and Indigenous Vegetation.

ANNEXES

1. Further information on the status of the WAP Complex (Tables 1 and 2)
2. List of threatened species in Niger and Burkina Faso

1.

Annex 1

Table 1 : Parks and hunting zones of the WAP Complex

Park Complexes	Benin	Burkina Faso	Niger
Pendjari Complex (6,000 km ²)	Pendjari National Park (2,750 km ²)		
	Pendjari Hunting Zone (1,800 km ²)		
	Atacora Hunting Zone (1,750 km ²)		
W Park Complex	W National Park (5,020 km ²)	W National Park (2,350 km ²)	W National Park (2,200 km ²)
	Djona Hunting Zone (1,150 km ²)		Tamou Reserve (760 km ²)
			Dosso Reserve (3065 km ²)
Arly National Park		Arly National Park (76,000 ha)	
		Singou Reserve (178,800 ha)	
		Pama Hunting Zones (HZ) (274,500 ha)	
		Konkonbouri HZ (35,000 ha)	
		Pagou-Tandougou HZ (35,000 ha)	
		Ouamou et Ougarou HZ (64,000 ha)	
		Kortiagou HZ (51,000 ha)	
	Koakrama HZ (25,000 ha)		

Table 2 : International Status of the National Parks Statuts internationaux des parcs nationaux

Park	Status	Benin	Burkina Faso	Niger
W	Ramsar Site	?	?	1987
	Biosphere Reserve	In progress		1996
	Natural World Heritage	Listed		1996
Pendjari	Ramsar Site			
	Biosphere Reserve	1986		1986
	Natural World Heritage			Yes
Arly	Ramsar Site		?	
	Biosphere Reserve			
	Natural World Heritage			

ANNEX 2: List of threatened species

Annex 2(a) Burkina Faso

Category	Extinct	Endangered	Threatened	Vulnerable
Mammals	Oryx		Panther Cheetah Elephant	Damaliscus Rufifrons gazelle Dorcas gazelle African wild dog
Birds			Abyssinian Calao	Crowned crane
Reptiles			Crocodile Python	
Fish				Protopterus (eel)
Ligneous plants		<i>Celtis integrifolia</i> <i>Adenium obesum</i>	<i>Ximania americana</i> <i>Pterocarpus lucens</i> <i>Vitex doniana</i>	<i>Khaya senegalensis</i> <i>Adansonia digitata</i> <i>Parkia biglobosa</i> <i>Butyrospermum paradoxum</i> <i>Prosopis africana</i>

Source: National Strategy and Action Plan of Burkina Faso, December 1999

Annex 2(b) Niger

SPECIES	STATUS	NUMBER	DECLINE	MAIN AREAS
Elephant	GT	5-600	B,C,H	« W » Tamou
Hippotamus	GT	200	A,H,P,S	« W », Ayorou
Giraffe	GT	<100	B,H,S	Boboye, Dallols (Dosso Preserve)
African buffalo	GT	5-600	B,F,H,P	« W » Tamou
Roan antelope	T	7-800	B,H	« W » Tamou
Bontobok	GT	<100	B,H,P	« W » Tamou
Bubale	T	4-500	B,H	« W » Tamou
Defassa waterbuck	T	<300	B,H,P,S	« W »
Buffon cob	T	<400	B,H,S,P	« W » Tamou, Sirba
Reed buck	T	<1000	F,H,P	« W » Tamou, Sirba
Bushbuck	T	1-2000	B,F,H	« W » Tamou
Dorcas gazelle	S	?	B,S	
Rufifrons gazelle	T	?	B,H,S	
Cape duiker	S	?	F,H	Sudanian zone
Red-flanked duiker	GT	<100	F,H,S	Mékrou Valley
Lion	GT	<100	D,H	« W » Tamou, Sirba
Leopard	E	Éxtinct ?	B,C	
Spotted hyena	GT	<50	D	« W » Tamou
Striped hyena	GT	<500?	D	Sahelian zone
Common jackal	S	?	D	Sudano-sahelian zone
African wild dog	E	Éxtinct ?	D,H	Sudano-sahelian zone
Manatee	GT	<100?	A,H	Niger River
Warthog	S	?	D	Sudano-sahelian zone
Spotted neck otter	E	Éxtinct ?	A,H	Rivers and streams
Cape clawless otter	GT	?	A,H	Rivers and streams
Patas	S	?	H,S	Sudano-sahelian zone
Green monkey	T	?	F,H	Gallery forests
Baboon	S	6-700	H,S	« W » Tamou

Source: J. E Newby quoted in Millington et al (1991) : la diversité biologique au Niger

E = Extinct; T = Threatened ; S = Stable; GT = Gravely threatened

Decline

A = Accidental death; B = Poaching/Hunting; C = Trade on animal or products; D= Destruction or poisoning; F = Bush fires; H = Loss of habitat; P= Illegal pasture; S = drought and desertification.