

# 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 08, 2013

Screeener: Paul Grigoriev

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

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT**    **GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5485

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Seychelles

**PROJECT TITLE:** Seychelles' Protected Areas Finance Project

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Environment and Energy (MEE) in close collaboration with Seychelles National Parks Authority (SNPA), Seychelles Island Foundation (SIP) and Ministry of Finance

**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 welcomes the submission of this proposal intended to improve the financial sustainability and administrative and management cohesion of the Seychelles' protected areas estate by improving the generation of PA finance through a variety of mechanisms and the realization of conservation benefits through a more effective use of the finances at the system level. Overall, the project presents an important and challenging undertaking but the need for it is clear and the timing is opportune as well.

1. The challenges confronting the effectiveness and sustainability of the country's PA system are indeed complex at present and looking ahead. The proposal identifies these in a comprehensive manner, as well as the linkages among them.
2. The proposed project is coherent and well-structured in addressing what are identified as the key barriers "system scale deficiencies and inconsistencies among the various PA subsets, and capacity deficiencies for ensuring sustainable and adequate levels of financing. The objective could perhaps be simplified to be "To improve the financial sustainability and strategic cohesion of the Seychelles protected area system in a dynamic national economic environment". The two Outcomes when achieved will clearly result in GEB and the activities and their outputs support their attainment.
3. The proposed use of FSS, METT and Capacity Development is noted as is the provision of most baselines for chosen indicators and targets.
4. On page 7 it is stated that currently, the PA system retains 48% of self-generated finance while a few lines later it is stated that governmental regulations do not allow PAs to retain their own revenues. This should be clarified, since this is one focus of the proposed project. While the potential for a variety of partnerships with the private sector is mentioned, this perhaps should receive a greater examination moving forward.
5. The proposal is somewhat light on the expected socio-economic benefits, largely due to its focus on institutional strengthening and revenue streams, but this is an area that ought to be explored further during the PPG.
6. While rated as being high already, the presented risk of "misunderstanding" among PA managing entities and resource users undermining the development and adoption of the proposed cohesive approach to PA management and finance could be even greater than anticipated. Plain conflict, disagreements and reticence to change will be stronger than misunderstandings. The proposed means of mitigating this risk could use more attention looking ahead. The risk of

climate change and its effects are not included in the risk table, although this is recognized as a significant cause for concern elsewhere.

7. The stakeholders definition is appropriate, although more focus on the effective engagement of local communities and resource users would be encouraged.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. <b>Consent</b>	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
2. <b>Minor revision required.</b>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:            (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions.            (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</p>
3. <b>Major revision required</b>	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:            (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP.            (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>