

# 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: April 08, 2011

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz  
Consultant(s): Thomas Hammond

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4456

**PROJECT DURATION :** 4

**COUNTRIES :** Uganda

**PROJECT TITLE:** Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Threatened Savanna Woodland in the Kidepo Critical Landscape in North Eastern Uganda

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** National Environment Management Authority (NEMA); Uganda Wildlife Authority

**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): **Major revision required**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes this project which capitalises on an opportunity to consolidate conservation and sustainable use of an important woodland complex. However, STAP cautions that the methodologies described for measuring results regarding biodiversity conservation including reduction of poaching and other pressures will need to be elaborated. STAP welcomes the landscape approach, considering PAs and surrounding areas in conjunction, but it is not clear how the project intends to protect the migration corridors beyond the PAs other than by intervening in the planning of infrastructure placement. It proposes Shea tree sustainable exploitation as one major way to provide livelihoods, particularly for women. However, it does not mention an explicit strategy for male returnees, or how two issues identified as major challenges – i.e. poaching and fires – will be tackled beyond the PAs. Charcoal production and land tenure are also mentioned as major issues, but it is not clear how these will be addressed in the project. One of the principal weaknesses evident in this document is that the project does not appear to address incentives for IDPs to respect the enforcement of the laws. However, unless the local population agrees with the authority's decision to add more gazetted protected area to the landscape, they are unlikely to respect it and the expected benefit to GEBs, including existing ones, can be threatened by merely expanding existing park boundaries. Enhanced patrolling and law enforcement may work as a diversity protection strategy within PAs, but it is unlikely to be sustained beyond them, considering the challenges faced by the returnees. Park enforcement is important, but also requires elements of participatory approval in order for this to be effective over the longer term - not just the local authorities cited in Component 2.2 encouraged to see the enforcement as protecting local resources for their benefit. It is perhaps useful to note that the words "participation" or "participatory" do not appear in this document. In addition, it is also unclear how the training programme referred to will be sustained beyond the project period.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. 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.
<b>2. 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: (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

	<p>an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review</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>
<p>3. <b>Major revision required</b></p>	<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>