

# 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: 8 October 2009

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley & Paul Ferraro

### I. PIF Information

**GEF PROJECT ID: 4026**

**PROJECT DURATION: 60 months**

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 4220**

**COUNTRY: Togo**

**PROJECT TITLE: SPWA- Strengthening the conservation role of Togo's national System of Protected Areas (PA)**

**GEF AGENCY: UNDP**

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER:** Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Directorate of Wildlife and Hunting), assisted by IUCN.

**Other partners:** Ministry of Agriculture, Joint Programme for Poverty Reduction and Localisation of the MDGs, PNADE (National Programme of Separate Actions for Environmental Management), European Commission.

**GEF FOCAL AREA (S):** Biodiversity

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):** BD-SO1-SP3

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:** GEF's Strategic Program for West Africa (SPWA)

### 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: **Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP welcomes the science-based approach to PA site selection and the difficult though practical decision to abandon failed protected areas in favour of improving management of PAs in the most significant sites for biodiversity conservation. This project is part of the Strategic Program for West Africa<sup>1</sup> and the Panel refers the World Bank to its general advice on this programmatic approach<sup>2</sup>.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. <b>Consent</b>	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. <b>Minor revision required.</b>	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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ol> 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. <b>Major revision required</b>	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.

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Work\\_Programs/November\\_2008\\_Work\\_Program/PFD\\_BD\\_3785\\_SPWA\\_West-Afr\\_BD.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Work_Programs/November_2008_Work_Program/PFD_BD_3785_SPWA_West-Afr_BD.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Work\\_Programs/November\\_2008\\_Work\\_Program/Stap%20review\(17\).pdf](http://www.thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Projects/Work_Programs/November_2008_Work_Program/Stap%20review(17).pdf)