

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: May 11, 2012

Screeener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Thomas Lovejoy
Consultant(s): Brian Huntley

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4855

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Tanzania

PROJECT TITLE: Kihansi Catchment Conservation and Management Project

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: National Environment Management Council (NEMC).

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): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP acknowledges this project to mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainability into the management of the Kihansi catchment working in tandem with and contributing to the Water Sector Development Project at the basin level.

The project consists of two related dimensions, the improvement of capacity to mainstream biodiversity into river basin planning and management, and on site actions to conserve species, habitats, soil and water. In this regard, the wording of the project objective could be more precise to present these two foci of the work more clearly.

The global environmental benefits are well presented. The Eastern Arc Mountains are a global biodiversity hotspot containing the highest ratio of endemic plant and animal species to area of any hotspot. The Kihansi ecosystems are globally significant due to the presence of a high number of endemic and critically endangered plant and animal species including the Kihansi Spray Toad (KST) and others. It is mentioned that the toad has gone extinct in the wild due to the presence of the chytrid fungus, which is endemic in the area. The population number has rebounded in captivity and the project intends to reintroduce it in the catchment. The rationale behind this, given the endemism of the fungus in the area that resulted in its extinction in the wild, and thus the likelihood of success, could be clarified. How the project intends to control amphibian diseases is unclear, although that is mentioned as one of its elements.

While threats are mentioned, their description could be improved in terms of their specificity, intensity and impacts. Barriers are not presented and should also be defined and described. The project framework ought to be structured on the basis of barrier removal.

Aside from the description of ongoing programmes and initiatives, no meaningful baselines are provided for the targeted elements of biodiversity, soil erosion, pesticide contamination etc.. This deficiency must be rectified in the further development of the project.

The precise difference between Components 1 and 2, as they are phrased, is not very clear. As mentioned above when referring to the project objective, the distinction between the focus of each could be made clearer. Component 1 addresses capacity building whereas Component 2 focuses on on the ground conservation activities. Following this rationale, Outcome 1.3 and Output iii) currently under Component 1 really ought to be under Component 2. Including the financing aspects under Component 2 seems somewhat artificial. Consideration should be given to perhaps having this aspect of the project as a separate component.

<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 required.	<p>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:</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>
3. Major revision required	<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>