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I. PIF Information (Copied from the PIF)

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4970
PROJECT DURATION: 5 COUNTRIES: Cote d'Ivoire
PROJECT TITLE: Integrated Management of Protected Areas in Cote d'Ivoire, West Africa

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Office Ivoirien des Parcs et Rareserves

GEF FOCAL AREA: Multi Focal Area

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 acknowledges UNEP's proposal "Integrated management of protected areas in CÃ´te d'Ivoire, West Africa". It supports the intended project objective to strengthen the protected area system based on a landscape approach and participatory processes involving key stakeholders. STAP also welcomes the proposed efforts to strengthen sustainable forest management as a means to generate ecosystem services. Through both interventions (strengthen protected areas and improve forest management), STAP believes there are substantial opportunities to generate global environmental outcomes and livelihood well-being co benefits for CÃ´te d'Ivoire. However, STAP believes the proposal could have been developed more thoroughly to substantiate its basic premise. As a result, STAP rates this proposal as major revision. Below, STAP articulates further how the proposal needs to be strengthened further in its design.

1. The project framework needs to be revisited because it fails adequately to capture the environmental changes being sought by project investments. The proposed interventions, along with their expected outcomes and outputs, are described only minimally. Expected Outputs and Outcomes are largely descriptors of activities, rather than changes brought about by the project. Some outcomes are almost identical to their respective outputs, indicating that the project developers appear not to understand the difference between the two columns. The outcome and output indicators also need to be defined to indicate what is going to be measured â€“ such as, protected area coverage for component 1 and 2.

2. STAP has concerns that if the project is further developed based on the current framework, there will be little or no focus on delivery of global environmental benefits.

3. Furthermore, STAP recommends further developing the rationale for component 1 and 2. For example, the proposal could define more explicitly the biodiversity value of the selected biodiversity protected areas (component 1), and the Banco National Park (component 2). For the latter, it is unclear, for example, what the scientific basis is for selecting this site over other parks that may be further away from Abidjan, and potentially with higher biodiversity value. While it may appear to be superficially attractive to undertake activities so close to the city centre, STAP has concerns that using this site as a pilot will give little or no guidance to protection of more significant biomes and larger tracts of land surrounded by land users who are poor.
4. The proposal needs to indicate more clearly what are the expected global environmental benefits, as well as define indicators for each benefit since the proposal expects to contribute to multiple benefits arising from biodiversity conservation, landscape management, and sustainable forest management. Additionally, the baselines need to be defined during the proposal development for each global environmental benefit. Currently, these are weakly described in the proposal.

5. In Section B3, the proposal makes ambitious claims for bringing co-benefits to local people, including micro-projects that favor women and employment opportunities for local people. Presumably, these benefits will feature as part of Component 3 (buffer zone) activities but it is not at all clear how these aspects can (or will) be integrated with PA management and protection of biodiversity. A PES scheme is also briefly mentioned with no mention of how it will be implemented and what measures will be introduced to ensure that it is well targeted.

6. For component 4, the project developers may wish to consult Dewi, S. et al. "Spatial indicators for the assessment of ecosystem services: Providing, benefiting and connecting areas and landscape metrics" Ecological Indicators 21 (2012) 80-88. The paper considers the spatial trade-offs of ecosystem services frameworks, and provides the spatial characteristics of ecosystem services. As the paper states "Spatial considerations are important not only for the estimation and valuation of ecosystem services but also for their maintenance. A good knowledge of the spatial structure necessary for a service can help considerably in avoiding degradation through the loss of species, or habitats."

7. A spatial approach takes into account the notion that areas that provide ecosystem services may not necessarily benefit from these services. In this regard, STAP also recommends for the proposal to account for the risk of non-maintenance of ecosystem services due to poor planning measures that excludes stakeholders generating services and who may not necessarily benefit from these services. The mitigation strategy also should be articulated in the proposal.

8. STAP suggests adding climate change projections, or trends, in the proposal. For this data, as well as adaptation measures that could be mainstreamed across the various interventions, the project developers may wish to consult the World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal- http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAP advisory response</th>
<th>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consent</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Minor revision required.</td>
<td>STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Major revision required</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>