REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022

GEF ID	11148
Project title	Wildlife Conservation for Development Integrated program (WCD IP)
Date of screen	12 January 2024
STAP Panel Member	John Donaldson
STAP Secretariat	Alessandro Moscuzza

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

This is a well constructed proposal with a sound logic expressed in the theory of change (TOC) and based on a good understanding of the technical and implementation issues. It is an ambitious IP, given its broad geographical scope and the intention to tackle three complex issues (human wildlife conflict, illegal and unsustainable use, development of wildlife economies). As a result, one of the challenges is how to achieve transformative impact that is more than the sum of the 15 child projects. In general the program framework document provides an adequate description of how this will be achieved and links the projects in different countries with particular transformation objectives. More detail on how the program will be transformative needs to be provided when designing the child projects and the global coordination project.

STAP concludes that this is a strong proposal and concurs that the concept has scientific and technical merit.

There are a number of issues that should be considered in the further development and design of the global coordination project and/or child projects. These include the development of indicators that are more representative of transformative outcomes, some reflection on scenarios or uncertain futures to ensure durable outcomes for the IP, and designing monitoring and learning systems for the wildlife economy component to limit possible perverse outcomes.

Note to STAP screeners: a summary of STAP's view of the project (not of the project itself), covering both strengths and weaknesses.

STAP's assessment*

Concur - STAP acknowledges that the concept has scientific and technical merit

- □ Minor - STAP has identified some scientific and technical points to be addressed in project design
- □ Major - STAP has identified significant concerns to be addressed in project design

Please contact the STAP Secretariat if you would like to discuss.

2. Project rationale, and project description – are they sound?

See annex on STAP's screening guidelines.

The PFD is based on a well developed **theory of change** that is scientifically sound and builds on the foundations and lessons learned from the Global Wildlife Program. The TOC follows from a thorough technical analysis, where a systems approach has been used to map the immediate threats to wildlife to a variety of underlying drivers. For the most part, the analysis provides a good synopsis of the main issues that the IP is intending to address. There are some aspects of the analysis that oversimplify the drivers, e.g. the emphasis on 'kingpins' as drivers of illegal trade underplays the extent, sophistication and depth of illicit economies and how they respond to anti-poaching policies; and there is no inclusion of market forces and changing demographic pressures under the section on legal and unsustainable use (Fig.2). These don't materially affect the structure of the IP but some suggestions have been included below for consideration.

The **program components** are well designed and provide a good explanation of how they fit into the TOC. The PFD also recognizes the importance of transformative change and links each of the components with transformation levers that could be applied in different countries. There is limited information on how these interventions will be transformative. This should be clarified in the development of child projects. Similarly, the PFD refers to scaling of successful solutions in several places, but does not specify what this means and if there are opportunities to scale existing solutions (e.g. from the GWP) or whether it means piloting and scaling solutions that will be tested as part of the WCD IP. The intention and opportunities for scaling should be made explicit in the child projects.

The IP needs to be more that the sum of its parts and the PFD provides a reasonable outline of how this will be achieved through learning and exchange between countries and collaboration with regional and global initiatives. There are some areas where the intention is well articulated but the actual interventions are less clear. For example, regional collaboration - many of the child projects represent individual countries or clusters of countries surrounded by other non-participating countries that face similar issues. The **risks** and **opportunities** associated especially with IWT and the wildlife economy are likely to be regional in nature so it will be important to provide adequate detail of how this will be achieved in the design of the child projects and the global coordination project. Similarly, the TOC refers to the need to reduce or manage demand. Most of the proposed interventions focus on reducing in-country demand, which is important, but it is not clear how much impact is dependent on reducing international demand and how this will be dealt with to achieve the desired level of change. Given the importance of international demand for a number of species, including several critically endangered and charismatic ones, this is an important blind spot that should be addressed during the design phase of the program.

The PFD has an appropriate focus on policy as a **lever for transformation** and recognizes the need for policy integration and coherence within countries and across regions. In support of this objective, it will be critical to ensure that policies, which may be informed by specific site or species-based approaches (e.g. tiger in Thailand or Jaguar in Colombia), can transcend these narrow contexts. The evidence from past interventions is that policies developed with particular species or sites in mind don't always result in systems transformation – they often lead to leakage (e.g. shifts in rhino poaching from secure areas to less secure ones), have weak transferability (e.g. efforts to reduce rhino poaching have had little effect on reducing poaching of marine species or plants, or even of large cats), and cannot respond quickly to new threats, shifts in demand patterns (e.g. the rapid rise of global trade in pangolin scales after 2014 or succulent plants after 2020) or changes in illicit trade networks brought about by new policies.

Note: provide a general appraisal, asking whether relevant screening guideline questions have been addressed adequately – not all the questions will be relevant to all proposals; no need to comment on every question, only those needing more attention, noting any done very well, but ensure that all are considered. Comments should be helpful, evaluative, and qualitative, rather than yes/no.

3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions

1. Develop indicators for the program that reflect achievements in transformative change. With the exception of the component on 'coexistence of people and wildlife', most of the indicators represent outputs (e.g. number of countries reporting changes in legislation) but do not provide any indication of whether the desired transformative change has been achieved. In the case of actions to encourage behaviour change, it will be important to measure actual change in behaviour rather than an 'intention to reduce consumption …' given that the scientific literature concludes that people's intentions are often a poor indicator of actual behaviour change. Further guidance on behavior change can be found in the STAP can be found in the STAP advisory document on behavior change[1].

[1] Metternicht, G., Carr, E., Stafford Smith, M. 2020. Why behavioral change matters to the GEF and what to do about it. A STAP Advisory Document. Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel to the Global Environment Facility. Washington, D.C.

2. Consider scenarios and uncertain futures. The risk section of the proposal acknowledges the potential impact of climate change but there is little discussion of how uncertain futures linked to other drivers may impact on project outcomes. The IPBES Sustainable Use Assessment noted the paucity of future scenarios for use of wildlife but did highlight that climate change, demographic changes and some technological advancements were likely to put far greater pressure on the use of wild species. Demographic pressures will certainly also affect human wildlife conflict whereas illegal wildlife trade is likely to be influenced by strongly established illicit economies in many of the countries involved in the IP and how they respond to program interventions. The program should consider these uncertainties to ensure long lasting outcomes. Further guidance on future narratives can be found in the STAP brief[2] and advisory document[3] on this topic.

3. Reduce the risk of perverse oucomes for the wildlife economy component. The logic for the development of wildlife economies assumes that when communities can access benefits from wildlife-based enterprises it will lead to better environmental outcomes. This is not necessarily true, as evidenced by overexploitation in communities reliant on wildlife for their livelihoods and highlighted in analyses of conservation enterprises. As the PFD acknowledges, good environmental outcomes will depend on having the right policies in place, good governance, effective enforcement etc (the IPBES Sustainable Use Assessment[4] identified a suite of enabling factors). The focus on economic aspects may also lead to perverse outcomes (e.g. negative outcomes linked to disturbance by tourists or attempts by game farmers in South Africa to register wildlife as domestic animals[5] possibly to circumvent environmental laws). To reduce the risk, the IP should consider developing a monitoring system with appropriate indicators that will enable project managers to detect and respond to any perverse outcomes at an early stage

Note: number key points clearly and provide useful information or suggestions, including key literature where relevant. Completed screens should be no more than two or three pages in length.

*categories under review, subject to future revision

[2] https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/2023-06/Simple%20Future%20Narratives%20brief_June%202023.pdf

[3] https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/202306/Exploratory%20Future%20Narratives%20Primer_June%202023.pdf

[4] IPBES (2022). Thematic Assessment Report on the Sustainable Use of Wild Species of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. Fromentin, J. M., Emery, M. R., Donaldson, J., Danner, M. C., Hallosserie, A., and Kieling, D. (eds.). IPBES secretariat, Bonn, Germany. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6448567.

[5] South African Government (2019). Amendment to the Regulations of the Animal Improvement Act 62 of 1998. Government Gazette No. 42464, 17 May 2019

ANNEX: STAP'S SCREENING GUIDELINES

1. How well does the proposal explain the problem and issues to be addressed in the context of the **system** within which the problem sits and its drivers (e.g. population growth, economic development, climate change, sociocultural and political factors, and technological changes), including how the various components of the system interact?

2. Does the project indicate how **uncertain futures** could unfold (e.g. using simple **narratives)**, based on an understanding of the trends and interactions between the key elements of the system and its drivers?

3. Does the project describe the **baseline** problem and how it may evolve in the future in the absence of the project; and then identify the outcomes that the project seeks to achieve, how these outcomes will change the baseline, and what the key **barriers** and **enablers** are to achieving those outcomes?

4. Are the project's **objectives** well formulated and justified in relation to this system context? Is there a convincing explanation as to **why this particular project** has been selected in preference to other options, in the light of how the future may unfold?

5. How well does the **theory of change** provide an "explicit account of how and why the proposed interventions would achieve their intended outcomes and goal, based on outlining a set of key causal pathways arising from the activities and outputs of the interventions and the assumptions underlying these causal connections".

    - Does the project logic show how the project would ensure that expected outcomes are **enduring** and resilient to possible future changes identified in question 2 above, and to the effects of any conflicting policies (see question 9 below).
    - Is the theory of change grounded on a **solid scientific foundation**, and is it aligned with current scientific knowledge?
    - Does it explicitly consider how any necessary **institutional and behavioral** changes are to be achieved?
    - Does the **theory of change diagram** convincingly show the overall project logic, including causal pathways and outcomes?

6. Are the project **components** (interventions and activities) identified in the theory of change each described in sufficient detail to discern the main thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they address the problem, their justification as a robust solution, and the critical assumptions and risks to achieving them?

7. How likely is the project to generate global environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF project (**additionality**)?

8. Does the project convincingly identify the relevant **stakeholders**, and their anticipated roles and responsibilities? is there an adequate explanation of how stakeholders will contribute to the

development and implementation of the project, and how they will benefit from the project to ensure enduring global environmental benefits, e.g. through co-benefits?

9. Does the description adequately explain:

   - how the project will build on prior investments and complement current investments, both GEF and non-GEF,
   - how the project incorporates **lessons learned** from previous projects in the country and region, and more widely from projects addressing similar issues elsewhere; and
   - how country policies that are contradictory to the intended outcomes of the project (identified in section C) will be addressed (**policy coherence**)?

10. How adequate is the project's approach to generating, managing and exchanging **knowledge**, and how will lessons learned be captured for adaptive management and for the benefit of future projects?

11. **Innovation and transformation:**
    - If the project is intended to be **innovative:** to what degree is it innovative, how will this ambition be achieved, how will barriers and enablers be addressed, and how might scaling be achieved?
    - If the project is intended to be **transformative:** how well do the project's objectives contribute to transformative change, and are they sufficient to contribute to enduring, transformational change at a sufficient scale to deliver a step improvement in one or more GEBs? Is the proposed logic to achieve the goal credible, addressing necessary changes in institutions, social or cultural norms? Are barriers and enablers to scaling be addressed? And how will enduring scaling be achieved?

12. Have **risks** to the project design and implementation been identified appropriately in the risk table in section B, and have suitable mitigation measures been incorporated? (NB: risks to the durability of project outcomes from future changes in drivers should have been reflected in the theory of change and in project design, not in this table.)