

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: October 7, 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3753

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 3938

COUNTRY: Mozambique

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Financing of the Protected Area System in Mozambique

GEF AGENCY: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Tourism (MITUR), National Directorate for Protected Areas

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM: SO1 – SP1 Sustainable Financing of PA Systems at the National Level

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: N/A

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(ies):
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP acknowledges the proposal on "Sustainable financing of the protected area system in Mozambique" and has some suggestions aimed at helping to strengthen the full project brief.
3. A key component of the proposed initiative is to demonstrate "at the site-level that a decentralized, co-management and revenue-sharing models can significantly strengthen the overall effectiveness and sustainability of the PA system...." Although such an approach has some intuitive appeal, little empirical evidence exists about the impact on environmental outcomes from decentralization, rights-based approaches and revenue-sharing. A forthcoming paper in Conservation Biology ("An assessment of 100 questions of greatest importance to the conservation of global biodiversity") identifies as important open questions the biodiversity impacts of decentralizing management authority, formally recognizing local customary rights and traditional institutions, and encouraging local participation in conservation planning and decision-making. This GEF-funded initiative in Mozambique should be designed to contribute to the evidence base in this area, rather than to assume it already exists. The targeted landscapes are vast and thus co-management work will necessarily have to be implemented in stages across the landscape and will not achieve full coverage by the end of the program. Thus there may be an opportunity to design the roll-out of the program in ways that allow for credible quantification of the biodiversity impacts of decentralized, co-management and revenue-sharing models. The key is to ensure that some of the variation in which sites are selected for early participation in the co-management efforts is unrelated to the biological and social welfare indicators that will be measured in the project. STAP is willing to advise the UNDP and its partners prior to CEO endorsement to design the project in such a way and thereby gain much greater insights into what works to protect biodiversity.
4. At CEO endorsement, STAP expects that the methods for monitoring ecological and socioeconomic indicators at the pilot sites will be fully elaborated, including the way in which "participative ecological monitoring by local communities" will be used.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	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. Minor revision	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as

<p>required.</p>	<p>early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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 <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. Major revision required</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>