



NAPA

News from African Protected Areas



Nouvelles des Aires Protégées en Afrique

N°71
January 2014



Edito (WPC – 10 months)
Geoffroy MAUVAIS
PAPACO coordinator

What is the purpose of the funds invested in the conservation of African protected areas?

Given the results we witness in the field, this question may indeed arise! In particular, when these funds serve the implementation of large projects (several million of euros over several years), asking it becomes all the more important. This is the topic this NAPA letter (and the followings) wishes to address. It is all but a new topic; we initiated its discussion during the World Conservation Congress in Barcelona, in 2008! Since then, we have thought, talked, consulted, procrastinated... It isn't easy to ask the question so straightforwardly, much less easy to obtain a clear answer. Convincing those who finance these projects to open their books is an arduous task. Yes, this is certainly the most difficult subject we have had to deal with, and that explains the long, very long time lapse it took before we started tackling this issue!

But finally we did it. With the support of Afrique Nature International (www.afnature.org), we tried, through case studies reviews, report analysis, interviews, and more, to understand why, in some unfortunately frequent cases, the results of conservation projects do not follow up to the investments. The objective was not to criticize, to break the existing tools, nor to teach a lesson... Rather, the goal was to understand better through an unbiased analysis of the situation, and to pave the way for a constructive discussion on the possible options for improvement. Everyone is free not to agree with our conclusions, but each of us should at least think consider this issue and offer solutions!

You'll see: the results of the study are not very positive. Read this summary (presented in this current NAPA letter and in the next NAPA, n°72) without taking it too much at heart, place the conclusions in their context, in your context. Ask yourselves about your own mistakes, your limitations, your failures. Of course, one can find examples of cons - and perhaps we have missed great successes. But I can hardly believe we are completely in the wrong, seeing that in the last few years our park assessments show a globally declining situation in the field... Let's be clear and honest with ourselves: too many means, often distributed with good intentions, are used in an ineffective way and sometimes are even counterproductive. Often too much money, too quickly spent, too badly given with too little control... has massive de- structuring impacts, can lead to the emergence of corruption, the destruction of vocations, a distrust for these very same good intentions, and the development of profiteering, greed, and cynicism. Too many projects follow the same way without affecting the curve of nature degradation. Some donors are even specialized in repeating everywhere the same approach, especially if it does not work anywhere! Just change the location, the title of the project, and start it all again! Is this really what we want? Can we continue this way?

Of course, this analysis should lead us further. We need to think for ourselves and bring forward suggestions: this will be the challenge of the NAPA letter n°73, in March, where we'll try the perilous exercise of drafting some recommendations, a prelude to what could later become a ' good practices guide ' for big projects and other ad hoc supports provided to protected areas. This is what is

planned under direction 7 of the Road Map for African protected areas (see www.papaco.org).

And because it also requires us to be objective, this approach is open to your comments, ideas, criticisms, initiatives... Let's see if together we can come up with anything promising for our protected areas!

Best wishes for 2014!

WPC – 10 months to go!

Results and effects of major conservation projects on protected areas in Central and West Africa (I / III)

(direction 7 of the Roadmap for African protected Areas)

Under the AGAPACO Project - Improving the Management of Protected Areas in Central and West Africa, financed by the French Development Agency (AFD), the IUCN Programme for African Protected Area Conservation (PAPACO) assigned Afrique Nature International the task of assessing the value and relevance of major conservation projects to protected areas at several levels : from design to project implementation, in terms of the results produced, the sustainability of actions and effects, as well as the links between the different phases of the programmes. The findings and conclusions of this study conducted in West and Central Africa will be used to draft a guide to good practice for the design and implementation of such projects.

Introduction

This study did not consist of awarding good or bad points to those responsible, from diverse backgrounds, who are trying, in most cases, to do their best. It focused principally on the analysis of intervention or management systems that facilitate - or the contrary hinder, if not block - the attainment of results. It leads into a series of proposals that will serve as axes of reflection for the development of the abovementioned guide to good practice.

In this issue 71 of NAPA, the background context for this reflection is briefly outlined, as well as the various forms of existing support to protected areas, before presenting the positive effects of major conservation projects. The next issue (NAPA No. 72) will cover the factors hindering the achievement of results, while a final section (NAPA No. 73) will propose guidelines to fuel future reflections on development of the guide.

I - OVERVIEW OF THE REGIONAL CONTEXT AND MAIN ISSUES

Biological riches that are greatly depleted in Central Africa and highly threatened in West Africa

A few figures suffice to recall the importance of the two regions for the conservation of biological diversity. Lowland and lower elevation forests of Central Africa host about 10,000 species of vascular plants of which 30% are endemic. Animal diversity is equally high, with some zoological groups in the region having undergone remarkable adaptive radiations resulting in the evolution of numerous species. There are also many endemic species in West Africa, whether plants (1800 species, 21%) or animals; mammals (67, 21%), notably including rare forest duikers; birds (75, 9.6%), reptiles (52, 25%), amphibians (85, 38%) and fish (143, 28%) (Conservation International, 2010).

In Central Africa, this biological capital is already greatly depleted. Logging and mining are increasingly opening up vast tracts of the Congo Basin forest block that were hitherto undisturbed. Demand for bush-meat never stops growing and commercial hunting affects more and more protected areas. Large scale trade has again intensified, the International Year of Biodiversity in 2010 having coincided with a new surge in the price of ivory and poaching. To the point where forest elephants in Central Africa saw their numbers fall by more than 60% in just ten years, from 2002 to 2011, with a concomitant loss of 30% of their range (Maisels et al., 2013). Sixteen species of birds and 23 mammals are considered threatened in this region (IUCN, 2010).



Elephants in West Africa - Nazinga

In West Africa, the situation is even more worrying with an alarming rate of habitat degradation resulting

in high numbers of species classified as threatened on the IUCN Red List, i.e. 1 212 species in the animal kingdom and 517 species of plants. In 50 years, the region has lost 90% of its dense forests and it accounts for 26% of global species whose survival depends on conservation measures, or 49% of the African total (IUCN, 2010).

The increase in anthropogenic pressures and their effects on the natural ecosystems of Central Africa

Central Africa has the peculiarity of showing completely opposite situations, between two very populous countries (Burundi : 280 inhabitants / km² and Rwanda : 368 / km²) and, except for São Tomé and Príncipe (156 inhabitants / km²), those where the whole or parts of their territory are characterized by densities below 20 inhabitants per km². Overall low population density, still quite economic development, and a not very dense road network, mean that the dense forests of Central Africa generally remain in better condition than their counterparts in other tropical regions of the world. However, with a population doubling every 25 to 30 years, the situation is more serious than it appears at first sight. There is no lack of threats to the ecosystem in this region: opening of communication routes, slash and burn agriculture, forestry and mineral exploitation, uncontrolled hunting leading more and more often to "silent forest syndrome", renewed ivory trafficking by mafia networks, informal levies, and lack of land use planning.



Bush fire in west Africa

These pressures exert three main effects on the vegetation: deforestation, fragmentation and degradation of habitats (Brugière, 2011). Less visible at first than these abuses of the natural environment, the uncontrolled use of wildlife constitutes a pressure of considerable magnitude. The drastic reduction in

animal densities in hunted areas (especially larger species) is the most obvious sign. But dwindling numbers of wildlife have direct consequences on overall ecosystem function, especially in forests. Since approximately 70% of plant seeds in dense forests are dispersed by animals, the disappearance of certain species will inevitably have a significant impact on the regeneration of forest cover. The elephant's role in seed dispersal is well known, but many other species, from primates to rodents, and without forgetting hornbills and touracos, contribute equally.

Disruption of plant landscapes in West Africa

Very numerous threats impact West Africa's natural ecosystems: drought, silting and wind erosion, late bush fires, widespread overexploitation of resources, intensive mining activities (on a large scale for bauxite, iron and gold, or artisanal scale for diamonds and gold), soil degradation, development of industrial-scale agriculture, agricultural and urban pollution. Without forgetting a doubling of the population in this region on average each quarter of a century. Poaching has reached such levels of exploitation that most protected areas, with rare exceptions, are affected, as they are in Central Africa, by the "empty spaces" syndrome.

Several publications help to gauge the physical upheavals that have affected this vast region for two generations. One cause can be attributed to drying of the climate (Beaudet, 1992; Mietton, 1988 Richard, 1990, GRID-Arendal, 2013). The succession of droughts in the 1970s and 1980s has induced a general lowering of isohyets by about 200 mm in thirty years and caused profound changes to plant landscapes (Paturel et al., 1994). But the drying climate remains too easy a justification for what is only the result of suicidal anthropogenic action.

In fact, while it can sometimes be difficult to attribute the share of responsibility for climate change either to natural evolutionary processes or the actions of man, it is obvious that the main cause in West Africa is the abrupt transformation of plant cover by the simple fact of human activities. Looting of natural habitats takes place everywhere, from the fragile Sahel to dense moist forests, passing through all types of savannas. The virtual disappearance of the former Guinean rainforest block in three to four decades is the best example of the human capacity to destroy, with the axe, fire and machete, millions of hectares of natural ecosystems. In little more than one generation, Côte d'Ivoire will have seen its cover of dense forest go from over 16 million hectares to less than two million.

The West African example of the drastic loss of rainforests, vegetation types that are the least sensitive to long term climatic variation, confirms, if confirmation were needed, that human action alone can cause radical changes to natural environments. In habitats of forest origin, it is no longer an issue of more or less alarming physiognomic and floristic transformations but of systematic destruction. Despite the immediate and well-known effect on soil fertility of the loss of adequate vegetation cover.

Migration flows and new players

Mineral resources of the African continent are greatly desired. The mining sector is in full development, thereby adding its own pressures to those already exerted by logging companies, agribusiness and extensive slash and burn. From a broader perspective, mining does not only cause profound changes in the natural environment, it also affects the social balance in sites of industrial production.

Strong migratory flows, especially in the West African region, exacerbate the destruction of natural habitats. It is understandable that "environmental refugees" coming from the Sahel, seek to settle in more amenable areas, but it is much more disturbing to see organized looting of the last forest resources. As is the case, for example, in western Côte d'Ivoire, where mass immigration, mainly from Burkina Faso, leads to the invasion of classified forests and some protected areas, under the protection of armed groups that devastate the last natural sites by transforming them into cocoa plantations. In the absence of sound land use policies, this specific example from Côte d'Ivoire could unfortunately be a harbinger of future conflicts, more or less overt, for access to arable land and water resources throughout the two regions.

A worsening spiral

One day we will have to address the serious problem of population explosion in Africa (in several countries, the rate of population growth exceeds 3% and the continental average is estimated at 2.5%).

According to UN projections, the population of the continent could be four times larger by the end of this century, going from just over 800 million to more than three billion. How many countries are ready to face up to the needs of such an increase, in terms of education, health, employment and management of natural resources? This quadrupling of the population will generate its share of crises and problems if not adequately prepared and controlled. And the responses needed to meet this challenge are already a reality in the three Central African

countries already mentioned and in areas such as the coast of the Gulf of Guinea or the Mossi Plateau in Burkina Faso, where densities of 130 inhabitants per km² of arable land had already been reached in places in the 1980s (Mietton, 1988).

This demographic growth, in the face of limited opportunities to meet the needs of new generations in poor areas, can only strengthen migratory flows, pressures and conflicts over access to land or water. The risk of multiplying conflicts, such as the one mentioned above in the Ivorian case, deserves to be taken seriously, because at least 18 violent conflicts in the world are considered to have occurred since 1990 and 40% of all internal conflicts that arose since 1950 were related to access to natural resources (UNEP, 2008; Beaumont, M. de, 2009).

Limits to the concept of climate change

The effects of the destruction of the natural environment on the climate are important; the Earth's albedo – the ratio of the amount of light reflected back to the atmosphere to that absorbed by the Earth's surface – is growing along with reduced plant cover, while evapotranspiration decreases simultaneously (Ericksen, 2001). A spiral of degradation is thus set in train, since the increase in albedo results in a decrease in precipitation, itself bringing about vegetation change generating increased erosion and reduced agricultural productivity.

The primary cause of climate change is therefore the destruction of plant cover by human action. The agricultural economist Jean Gorse illustrated this well, noting that "the desert does not descend from north to south, it 'goes back' from south to north". A visual image to remind us that the ecological health of Sahelo-Saharan countries also depends on maintaining a sufficient amount of forest cover in countries farther south and that the fight against desert encroachment is a regional issue (Gorse and Steeds, 1987). Many technicians and officials, however, obscure this fact and focus instead only on the effects of climate change on natural ecosystems; this concept has anyway become an obligatory fashion, without reference to which it is difficult to attract the attention of policymakers.

Far too little consideration of the conservation of natural resources

The previous sections are enough to paint an alarming picture. The inadequate means allocated to management of natural resources prevents the establishment of effective conservation systems and the situation never ceases to deteriorate. With rare

exceptions, there is no sign of reaction to this destructive spiral that gives hope of better days. To the point where it is legitimate to wonder if any protected areas worthy of the name still exist in certain countries of the two regions.

A few figures explain more than a long discussion:

♣ The 24 ecoregions of West Africa have a very variable level of protection, exceeding 10% in only three of them (Coastal forests of Cross River-Sanaga-Bioko, Atlantic coastal desert, Mangroves) but well below 10% for all others; a figure completely inadequate to ensure the long-term conservation of key regional ecosystems. Thus, only 3% of lowland forests are classified in IUCN categories I to IV (Conservation International, 2010; Jacques et al, 2010. IUCN, 2010, IUCN and UNEP, 2010).

♣ In Central Africa, because of the vastness of the region, the figures are misleading. The Congo Basin contains 341 protected areas, covering 570,000 km², but this total includes 188 areas (380 000 km²) of Category VI, with low protection status; ultimately, there are only 48 national parks totaling 180,000 km², just 4.4% of the 4,048,470 km² of this forest block (IUCN and UNEP , 2010).

However, the vital importance of national parks and equivalent reserves for the conservation of biological diversity is demonstrated on all continents. In fact, it is only by each country preserving a representative sample of different ecosystems within a network of sites that serve as viable natural refuges for animal and plant species, that the objective of in situ biodiversity conservation can be achieved.

An unprecedented crisis, combined with a lack of education, information and communication activities

We had to wait for the International Year of Biodiversity in 2010 to witness the return of elephant massacres comparable to those prior to the inclusion of this species in Appendix I of the Washington Convention. But the disappearance of the elephant is accompanied by the loss of a host of other species and, very quickly, vital ecological processes. Indicative of a worsening situation, the disappearance of this species over large areas of Central and West Africa where it recently numbered in the thousands, is the worst signal that could be given as to the future of regional biological richness.

In both regions, the issues of conservation of natural resources remain almost completely misunderstood, from local communities to the highest levels of decision making. The merits of maintaining biodiversity, the existence of a protected area or its

conservation are sometimes widely and openly criticized. Too often around national parks and reserves, the players do not show an awareness of the risks linked to the degradation of biodiversity and still less any sign of interest in conserving these natural sites.

It is certain, when considering these issues, that there remains much to do to put national park and nature reserve services in the place they should normally occupy in the life of a nation.



Poaching in West Africa

II - FORMS OF SUPPORT TO PROTECTED AREAS AND MAJOR CONSERVATION PROJECTS

Wherever it is in the world, no protected area network can be conserved without a substantial contribution from the state. As highlighted in the previous overview of the regional context and with a few very rare exceptions, lack of interest in the maintenance of natural sites is, on the contrary, the rule. So it is not surprising that funding for the conservation of protected areas in the two regions has in recent decades greatly benefited from programmes of bilateral and / or multilateral cooperation.

This support has taken several forms:

- long-term technical assistance (notably in the implementation of conservation services), usually accompanied by financial assistance
- Small local operations (GEF Small-scale grant programmes, FFEM Small Grants Programme, specific funds at the discretion of cooperation agencies)
- major conservation projects with funding in the order of tens of millions of euros over several years

- action by non-governmental conservation organizations, either their own funds or as service providers on behalf of major donors

More recently two other forms of support have appeared:

- the establishment of sustainable financing mechanisms
- reducing emissions of greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation and degradation of forest ecosystems (REDD+); this international policy, about which many questions are still asked, gives a market value per tonne of carbon stored in the vegetation and the soil, and this value is supposed to generate substantial funds in return for maintaining forest cover.

Long-term technical assistance which was wrongly viewed as "substitution", was withdrawn to a considerable extent from the protected area sector in the 1990s. National officials of the departments responsible for conservation thus lost a valuable voice when it came, among other things, to organizing advocacy for protected areas. At the same time, the development of small operations, despite the great laboratory interest in supporting local initiatives, can only have a limited impact on the conservation of protected area networks.

For the moment, sustainable financing mechanisms essentially take the form of foundations, since payments for environmental services are still in their infancy and are struggling to move beyond the experimental stage.

In both regions, foundations are still, for the most part, in the process of establishing their capital: the Foundation for the Sangha Tri-National - FTNS (Cameroon, Congo and CAR), the Foundation for Parks and Reserves of Côte d'Ivoire (FPRCI) and more recent initiatives, the BIO Foundation of Bissau Guinea, the BACoMaB Foundation in Mauritania and the West African Savannas Foundation (WASF) in Benin. These will play an important role as complementary sources of funding, provided that important communication work is conducted at the same time so that states do not take advantage by disengaging. Still too closely linked to the public sector, these young foundations are mainly confined to the role of fundraising and have not yet become key players in conservation in their respective countries.

This very brief observation is enough to highlight the importance of the role played by major bi- and/or multilateral cooperation projects in this sector. However, protected area managers generally remain

rather sceptic in their assessment of the effects of the implementation of this kind of support. It is clear that results on the ground are not proportional to the amount of money invested and a waste of financial and human resources is sometimes mentioned, particularly in view of the weak sustainability of these projects' final gains. While the trend is to set up projects with ever larger budgets and ever larger ambitions, it is this phase shift between everything that the "major project" tool can bring, and the reservations that it arouses among many beneficiaries that justified the reflection initiated by the IUCN PAPACO Programme.

The selection of study projects should be representative of the principal major donors present in both regions and should also take into account both multi- and bilateral cooperation. Wherever possible, the sample of major projects studied should also cover similar situations in terms of socio-political balance and governance so that the comparison of the rate of successful implementation is not biased by external factors.

In West Africa, the sample of major projects focused on the Region delimited by the W, Arly and Pendjari (WAP) transboundary protected areas in Benin, Burkina Faso and Niger:

- the PAPE project, following the ECOPAS project, funded by the European Commission
 - the PAUCOF project funded by AFD / FFEM
 - the WAP project funded by UNDP-GEF
- and two other projects in Burkina Faso and Guinea:
- the PAGEN project financed by WB-GEF
 - the Mount Nimba project funded by UNDP-GEF

For Central Africa, three programs were selected:

- the different phases of the ECOFAC project funded by the European Commission
- the CARPE program financed by USAID
- PACEBCo project, funded by the ADB

The study report provides a detailed description of these projects (www.papaco.org).

III - POSITIVE FACTORS

Major projects are characterized by their search for more comprehensive action than other types of intervention and seek to strike a balance between achievements on the ground, serving as points of references, and openness to experimentation with new approaches and capacity building.

Often a precursor role, with an undeniable catalysing effect and an ability to generate dynamics

Without the support of ECOFAC, which was instrumental in the creation of Lope National Park, our national park network would no doubt not exist.

Lee White, Executive Secretary
Gabon National Agency for National Parks

Large aid agencies and bilateral cooperation were focused primarily on conservation of natural resources, well before the Rio Conference brought biodiversity conservation to the foreground of international concerns. If support remained very sectoral until the early 1990s, the Earth Summit had the advantage of moving the debate onto a more global level.

In the opinion of officials of the Gabon National Agency of National Parks, the creation of a protected areas network in that country in 2002 would probably never have been possible without the involvement of the ECOFAC programme. Indeed, this programme was able to mobilize officials right up to the Brussels headquarters when the creation of Lope National Park, the first of the current network in the country, ran up against forestry interests and FSC certification in the southern part of the site. Thanks to ECOFAC, this park was able to exist and today is a World Heritage Site. Most importantly, the example of this support positively influenced the decision of the Head of State to add another twelve national parks throughout the territory of Gabon. Undeniably, during its first two phases, ECOFAC played an essential role in nature conservation in Gabon.

Other similar examples could be cited, but it is especially when a cross-border or regional dynamic is needed that these major projects play a key leading role. Sub-regional, transboundary, or tripartite agreements would certainly never have happened or would have been considerably delayed if the catalyzing effect of a major project had not been present.

Capacity building

This is a valuable asset of all major projects. They are a crucible allowing all those who contribute to implementation (drivers, guides, technicians, managers) to hone their skills or to become more specialized. The three major projects (CARPE ECOFAC and ECOPAS) and also those of more medium size, have trained a pool of professionals at

various levels of design and intervention.

Over the past two decades, the average level of ability of actors in the world of conservation has improved considerably and major projects have contributed to this global capacity. To a lesser extent, the strengthening of institutions responsible for the management of protected areas has also benefitted from their contributions, but more indirectly.



Capacity building is a major asset of large projects and long-lasting programmes

The acquisition and sharing of knowledge

Another strong point of major projects is they offer the possibility of conducting the necessary studies of the history, context and the problems in which their implementation will be set. In remote situations and areas where data are generally lacking, they have the advantage of setting reference frameworks.

Despite disconnections between different intervention phases, the fact of working in the long term has created a dynamic of scientific activity. It is not unreasonable to consider that major projects have paved the way for these laboratories without walls to become places of research and reference stations. The volume of documents produced by major projects (theses, DEA and masters) attests to the significant scientific contribution that unfortunately remains too often underused (ECOFAC is the only programme to have devoted enough attention to disseminating the knowledge collected).

Sharing knowledge and information / training activities has also brought beneficial effects; for example by holding community or inter-community workshops and supporting local initiatives, which all foster social cohesion between the populations of different villages and communities, beyond a better

overall awareness of issues related to protection and management of natural resources.

Effects that strengthen the protection of natural sites

A major project can provide moral support or pressure to curb or halt the appetite of mining companies (as in W, for example, but often however, with mitigated results, as recently in Virunga National Park in DR Congo).

On a more pragmatic level, the teams in place offer technical skills and a good command of logistics that result in achievements of professional quality that are of undeniable benefit to the relevant services.

Outside the field of conservation, major development projects that incorporate environmental concerns may also help to maintain biodiversity. Thus in Burkina Faso, PAPSA (funded by the World Bank) expended nearly one million dollars in 2011 on an emergency hydraulic programme to alleviate drought in some protected areas (including the provision of tanks to fetch water from far away). None of the departments concerned had thought about providing a water supply to save wildlife.

Permanence of support, volume of funding and the appropriate spatial scale

All major projects provide, to varying degrees, one of the three benefits mentioned in the subtitle of this section, without necessarily providing the right solution that can only be a clever combination of these criteria.

It is undeniable that large funding over a wide area has a greater capacity to bring together stakeholders around approaches, strategies and common tools. In general, this support comes in a rigid framework and a limited time frame. In contrast, as done by the German Cooperation Organization, it may be preferable to devote large funding to a limited area, but allocate much more time. The advantage being to allow the faculty to improve the choices made, to the extent that it is no longer necessary to spend large budgets in too short a period of time. But the effects on the overall plan can of course have the same impact.

Major projects also seek, much more than initiatives on a smaller spatial scale, to integrate an approach to planning with attempts to improve the assignment of rural areas and their modes of governance.



Lopé National Park in Gabon

The capacity to make the difference at a given moment

Major conservation projects can greatly enhance the range of tools to support conservation (the power of investment, provided, however, that the infrastructure and equipment financed do not represent overvalued needs; mobilization of additional resources: provision of multidisciplinary teams for research or technical assistance, information and communication capacity at various levels).

A strong commitment to a particular time can be critical to the success of conservation efforts, not least because a major project is necessarily more likely to take the debate to the appropriate level of decision making. Experience shows that the mere presence of a major donor is important in stimulating interest by national authorities in the subject of the project. And the political dimension is always critical when one touches on questions of land management that are at the heart of the general problems facing conservation.

But, also, even if this is less obvious, large scale support facilitates the emergence or strengthening of local initiatives, creating associative or community dynamics, or the development of a praiseworthy spirit of enterprise at the individual or family level.

Whether it is the example of CARPE, ECOFAC or ECOPAS, major projects have certainly helped to maintain the ecological balance in their areas of intervention and a continuity of protective actions, despite for some of them, the loss of performance during interruptions in support. The importance of the presence of ECOFAC for the creation of national parks of Gabon has already been mentioned, but one could also recall that a few years before the launch of ECOPAS, an IUCN report considered the possibility of downgrading Park W due to the loss of

control by the management authorities and its invasion by livestock herders and farmers (Monfort et al., 1994). Thanks to investments by the European Commission, in a few years control was restored, environmental degradation stopped and the return of wildlife assured, at the heart of a complex of protected areas that constitutes, along with the adjacent natural sites, a heritage unique in West Africa.

When the state cannot do anything, or apparently will not undertake anything significant in the short or medium term, major projects have an immense rescue effect on protected areas in the two regions. In their areas of intervention, they have largely ensured the maintenance of natural capital (ECOFAC in Central Africa, Project Pendjari in Benin) or a remarkable restoration (as is the case with ECOPAS in West Africa).

In the next NAPA : limiting/hindering factors, difficulties and limits to these large projects ...

Quick bibliography

- BEAUDET, G. (1992). - Dynamique et dégradation des milieux physiques de l'Ouest africain. *Annales de Géographie*, 1992, vol. 101, n° 564 : 214-219.
- BEAUMONT, M. de (2009). – *Prévenir les conflits par une gestion intelligente et une utilisation durable des ressources naturelles. Modus Operandi*, Paris. www.irenees.net/bdf_fiche-analyse-908_fr.html
- BRUGIERE, D. (2011). - Les pressions et leurs effets sur le milieu forestier. In : Lauginie, F., Chatelain, C. et Brugièrè, D. *Conserver la biodiversité du Bassin du Congo - Les actions du FFEM*. Document de capitalisation. FFEM, Paris : 20-22.
- CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL (2010). - *The Biodiversity Hotspots - Guinean Forests of West Africa*. www.conservation.org/where/priority_areas/hotspots/africa/Guinean-Forests-of-West-Africa/Pages/default.aspx
- ERIKSEN, S.E.H. (2001). - Linkages between climate change and desertification in East Africa. Part 1: Physical and social linkages. Part 2: Policy linkages between climate change and desertification. *Arid Lands Newsletter*, 49.
- IUCN (2010). - *Atlas - Biodiversity of the Francophonie - Richness and Vulnerabilities*. IUCN Euro/IEPF/OIF, Bruxelles, Paris and Québec, 225 pp + appendices.
- JACQUES, J.C., LAUGINIE, F. et CHAFIL, R. (2010). - *Atlas - Biodiversité de la Francophonie – Richesses et vulnérabilités*. IUCN Euro/IEPF/OIF, Bruxelles, Paris et Québec, 227 pp + annexes.
- GORSE, J.EE. et STEEDS, D.R. (1987). - Desertification in the sahelian and soudanian zones of West Africa. *World Bank Technical Paper*, 61 : 5.
- GRID-Arendal (2013). - *Afrique : Les conséquences des changements climatiques*. www.grida.no/publications/vg/africa-fr/
- LAURANS, Y., LEMENAGER, T. et AUBID, S. (2011). - *Les paiements pour services environnementaux, de la théorie à la pratique, quelles perspectives dans les pays en développement*. Coll. A savoir, n°7, AFD Editions, Paris.
- MAISELS, F., STRINDBERG, S., BLAKE, S., WITTEMYER G., HART, J. et al. (2013). - Devastating Decline of Forest Elephants in Central

Africa. PLoS ONE 8(3): e59469. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0059469.

- www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0059469
- MIETTON, M. (1988). - *Dynamique de l'interface lithosphère-atmosphère au Burkina Faso. L'érosion en zone de savane*. Université de Grenoble I et EDITEC, Caen, 2 vol., 511 pp + annexes.
- MONFORT, A., AGBO, V., ATOKE, P., FRAME, G., SAKHO, A.L., SINSIN, B., SODEGLA, H. et SOURNIA, G. (1994). - *Préparation d'une stratégie de conservation et de gestion des aires protégées : Composante Aménagement et gestion*. UICN, PGRN : 25, 31.
- PATUREL, J., SERVAT, E., LUAME, B., BOYER, F.F., LUBES, H. et MASSON, J.M. (1994). - *Manifestations de la sécheresse en Afrique de l'Ouest non sahélienne. Cas de la Côte d'Ivoire, du Togo et du Bénin*. ORSTOM, Abidjan, 26 pp.
- PNUE (2008). - From conflict to peace building. The Role of Natural Resources and The Environment. 31 pp + annexes www.postconflict.unep.ch/publications/pcdmb_policy_01.pdf or www.unep.org/pdf/pcdmb_policy_01.pdf
- RICHARD, J.F. - Ed. (1990). - *La dégradation des paysages en Afrique de l'Ouest*. Séminaire de Dakar (novembre 1988). Ministère de la Coopération et du Développement / Presses Universitaires de Dakar, 1990, 310 pp.
- UNEP and IUCN (2010). - *World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA)*. www.unep-wcmc.org/world-database-on-protected-areas-wdpa_76.html

More on www.papaco.org



REMINDER
WIN YOUR PARTICIPATION TO THE
CONGRESS!!!



Good governance and effective management of protected areas in Africa in 2014...

A message for the World Parks Congress Sydney 2014

As presented in the previous NAPA letter, the World Parks Congress will enable conservation professionals to meet and take stock of progress made since Durban. And also to discuss the challenges that have emerged since then. For three years now, IUCN-Papaco has been focusing on governance in the context of the Roadmap for African protected areas: more **ethical behavior**, more **legitimacy** in guidance, **accountability** and **transparency in decisions**, more stakeholders involved, more **professionalism** for managers, more **ownership** of the tremendous assets that PAs

offer, more **recognition** for those who succeed, more **durability** for conservation ... it would be important to show progress in that direction during the congress.

To do this, **IUCN-Papaco is willing to support a group of stakeholders working in and around protected areas in Africa so that they can attend the congress, in Sidney, November 2014, and present their expectations, their ambitions, their work, their concerns also...**

A small team for a few messages

The objective is to prepare key messages that will be brought to the WPC by a team of stakeholders coming from all over the continent and working in or with PA. These messages will cover the key aspects of PA good governance, PA management efficiency and the sustainability of conservation and will be illustrated by examples from different categories of protected areas.

Streams and themes

that are prioritized for this initiative:

Stream 1: reaching conservation goals
Stream 5: reconciling development challenges
Stream 6: enhancing the diversity and quality of governance
Stream 8: inspiring a new generation

And cross-cutting themes:

Theme 2: World Heritage
Theme 3: capacity development

The way forward

A dozen of key stakeholders will be selected early 2014 (February) through this call for applications, ensuring as far as possible a regional and linguistic balance. Working in or around the PAs, they will come from all across the continent, will represent the various governance possibilities (state, private sector, communities...), will illustrate the different profiles (ranger, guide, private operator, scientists, NGOs, civil society...).

Then they'll work all year long to prepare the congress. Each stakeholder will then develop his presentation, and will seek to collect other good examples, success stories, challenges, solutions... In November 2014, the group will participate to the congress, and will have the opportunity to present its work during the various sessions of the congress and

in the many possible ways (plenary, working-group meetings, side-events, posters...).

How to apply?

Please ask the application form to geoffroy.mauvais@iucn.org and send your proposal as soon as possible.

Deadline for application is the 20th January 2014



This program is funded by the French Development Agency



JRC Workshop on Remote Sensing for Conservation – Ispra, Italy

The JRC expert workshop on Remote Sensing for Conservation, held from 30 September till 2 October 2013 at the premises of the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission (JRC) in Ispra, Italy and jointly organized by the JRC, the Zoological Society of London and the CEOS Biodiversity Group, discussed “real-world” implementation of remote sensing data to conservation policy with a particular focus on developing countries. About 30 participants including scientists and decision makers, demonstrated and debated how existing remote sensing methods, products and tools have been and can be used to guide conservation policy, highlighting the obstacles and further needs for mainstreaming remotely sensed information into conservation policy making.

The workshop started by reviewing a series of related initiatives and workshops that took place in recent years, including the Cambridge Conservation Initiative workshop in 2010 which focused on the conservationists needs from remote sensing, the CEOS-biodiversity group workshop in 2012 which analysed the main ways that remote sensing is used

for biodiversity research and a recent workshop held in 2013 in Shepardstown, USA, which identified the top questions in conservation that could be addressed through remote sensing. Lastly, an initiative headed under UNEP-WCMC and presented at the recent CBD- SBSTTA 17 meeting, proposed ways in using remote sensing as a tool to track progress towards national and international conservation targets. Common for all workshops was the necessity for better communication between the remote sensing and conservation communities.



The workshop participants, at Ispra

The workshop continued by showcasing a few concrete and successful examples from Africa and Latin America of “real-world” implementation of remotely sensed information to conservation policy. Presenters demonstrated which and how remote sensing data, methods and tools have been implemented in supporting and influencing decisions for protected areas managers and conservation policy makers.

One of the key questions the workshop addressed was on how to mainstream remote sensing information into conservation policy – what are the difficulties, how can we bridge the gap? Participants identified three different levels of decision makers and agreed on the need of scalability of information suitable for all decision maker levels. However, participants also noted that in order to bridge the gap between researchers and policy makers an improved communication infrastructure including clearer and simplified scientific product packaging is necessary.

In small working groups the invited experts addressed key topics which were focused around the axis of technical/thematic nature of remote sensing data, tools and products – the role of the space agencies – capacity building, standard workflows and

remote sensing for conservation handbook, remote sensing and conservation working group, communication.

Finally, the message conveyed by the invited experts is the need of a sustained communication between the remote sensing and conservation community. The establishment of networks through working groups has been highlighted as the mechanism to accomplish this. The CEOS-biodiversity initiative and the recently launched Conservation Remote Sensing Working Group (CRSWG) offer a platform for both remote sensors and conservationists to continue within a bigger community the “bridging the gap” process initiated during the series of remote sensing for conservation workshops.

More details about the workshop can be found here:
<http://remote-sensing-biodiversity.org/ceos/workshop2013>

Conservation Remote Sensing Working Group
https://groups.google.com/forum/?hl=en#!forum/Conservation_RS

AniMove: Animal Movement - Analysis for Conservation

Course Dates

31th March – 11th April 2014

Location

Smithsonian-Mason School of Conservation, Front Royal, VA, USA Animal movement is critical for maintenance of ecosystem services and biodiversity. The study of complex movement patterns and of the factors that control such patterns is essential to inform conservation research and environmental management. Technological advances have greatly increased our ability to track, study, and manage animal movements. But analyzing and contextualizing vast amounts of tracking data can present scientific, computational, and technical challenges that require scientists and practitioners to master new skills from a wide range of computational disciplines.

AniMove (www.animove.org), a collective of international researchers, teaches a two-week intensive training course on *Animal Movement Analysis for Conservation*. The course focuses on interdisciplinary approaches linking animal movement with environmental factors to address challenging theoretical and applied questions in conservation biology. Focusing on these approaches, participants acquire significant skills in

computational ecology, modeling, remote sensing and Geographic Information Systems (GIS).

For full details and online application form, see *AniMove: Animal Movement Analysis for Conservation* course webpage at: smconservation.gmu.edu

**Visit www.animove.org
Apply by: January 20, 2014**

The RSPB is recruiting 2 positions in Liberia: Project Manager + Field Research Advisor

The "securing Liberian forest connectivity through community forest management and innovative financing mechanisms" project is an exciting new eu-funded project building on the RSPB's long-term initiative supporting the management of the Gola rainforest national park in Sierra Leone and the 'across the river, a transboundary peace park' project. This project marks the first step to the long-term initiative to conserve the Gola landscape in Liberia, a global priority for biodiversity conservation. The RSPB is seeking a dynamic project manager to manage the overall operational and strategic implementation of the project and a field research advisor to coordinate day-to-day field operations.

Both contract are 2 year Fixed Term contracts Closing date: **20 January 2014**. For complete details (including an application form) please see www.rspb.org.uk

For questions about these posts:
PeterTaylor = peteraj.taylor@rspb.org.uk



FFEM-PPI Request for proposal for consultancy services

In the frame of the Small-Scale Initiatives Program (PPI-3) of the French Global Environment Facility (FFEM), the Protected Areas Program of IUCN in PACO is looking for a **qualified consultant specialized in beekeeping**, in particular in **construction, installation and maintenance of hives, in beekeeping processing and in beekeeping products marketing**. He'll support two civil society organizations based in Ghana.

The terms of references are available on www.papaco.org or can be asked to the contact below for more details. Technical and financial bids should be sent to Arsene Sanon (arsene.sanon@iucn.org) by the **10th of January 2014**.

NAPA – CONTACTS

www.papaco.org and www.iucn.org

geoffroy.mauvais@iucn.org

Program on African Protected Areas & Conservation – PAPACO

IUCN-ESARO (East/South Africa)

leo.niskanen@iucn.org

Coordination - Program on Conservation Areas and Species Diversity – CASD

christine.mentzel@iucn.org

Program Officer – BIOPAMA – World Heritage

IUCN-PACO (West/Central Africa)

sebastien.regnaut@iucn.org

Coordination – program on Protected Areas

bora.masumbuko@iucn.org

Program Officer – Climate Change

florence.mazzocchetti@iucn.org

Program Officer – Forest protected Areas – Congo basin

youssouph.diedhiou@iucn.org

Program Officer - World Heritage

lacina.kone@iucn.org

Program Officer - Conservation Territories – Support to local NGOs

thomas.bacha@iucn.org

Program Officer - Small Grants for Conservation (PPI) – Support to local NGOs

arsene.sanon@iucn.org

Program Officer - Small Grants for Conservation (PPI) – Support to local NGOs

The opinions expressed in this newsletter do not necessarily reflect those of IUCN