

REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022

GEF ID	11523
Project title	Safeguarding the future of Namibia's Protected Area Network through Financing4Future
Date of screen	29 May 2024
STAP Panel Member	John Donaldson
STAP Secretariat	Alessandro Moscuza

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

This is a well developed proposal that is designed to overcome chronic funding shortfalls for the management of protected areas in Namibia and ensure that Namibia can adequately protect globally significant biodiversity.

Strengths include a solid description of the current situation, a preliminary evaluation of sustainable solutions and a credible approach to securing more sustainable financings. The project logic is also clearly set out in the theory of change and the suite of outputs and outcomes are mostly well designed to achieve the objectives.

STAP assessed this project as 'concur' but nevertheless identified several aspects, where the proponents should provide further information during the next stage of project development. These areas include clarity on where the financial knowledge management strategy fits into the project design and additional information on the potential biomes for carbon credits (see Sections 2 & 3).

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

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 proposal outlines the challenges facing the protected area (PA) system in Namibia, particularly the chronic underfunding of the PA network and how funding shortfalls undermine the country's ability to deliver global environmental benefits (GEBs). The **background description** is supported by recent assessments and analyses of budget allocations together with a table of how income from parks and other sources is allocated and managed. The proposal does include finance projections where future underfunding is projected together with possible gap-filling contributions from different sources.

The **project rationale** for a more sustainable financing model is well presented and the barriers are clearly identified and illustrate a sound understanding of both the problem and the potential solutions. The proposal includes actions to fully evaluate all the proposed funding options, but it would have been helpful at this stage to have more information on proposed carbon credits, notably which biomes could be targeted and whether they are linked to avoided deforestation or restoration, since these details have downstream implications for project design and implementation. STAP also welcomes the acknowledgement by the proponents that any consideration of financing from biodiversity offsets will be carefully considered to ensure that an appropriate policy can be developed, which conforms to best practice and ensures at least no net loss of GEBs.

The **theory of change (ToC)** clearly describes the pathways towards achieving the objectives. The diagram effectively illustrates the logic flow from the formulation of the problem to the outputs and outcomes and how these align to achieve the overall objective.

The **components** are mostly well described and align with the ToC. However, the **project description** maps out three strategies comprising (i) the enabling environment, (ii) mobilizing finances, and (iii) developing financial knowledge management systems. In contrast, the components only address the first two so the proposal should clarify whether the third strategy is embedded in the other two and why it is not given its own outcomes and actions. It is also not clear what output 1.2.2 is intending to achieve when it refers to 'at least two gender-responsive policies' being developed.

The proposal discussed other related projects and detailed how the project aligns with the Sustainable Finance for Wildlife project (SFW), where there could be potential overlaps and where the SFW project's results will be needed to inform aspects of the proposed project. These appear to be adequately dealt with for this stage of project development.

Component 1, on the enabling environment, includes outputs for **gender mainstreaming** and there is an intention to undertake gender-inclusive assessments and develop gender-responsive 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. Provide more information on the biomes where carbon credits may be envisaged and whether potential credits are linked to avoided deforestation or restoration. The need for more information is to determine whether this is a realistic option and what the downstream implications would be for project implementation.
2. Clarify how the strategy relating to financial knowledge management is going to be achieved and why it is not included as a component with its own outputs and outcomes.
3. Clarify the intention of output 1.2.2 and provide a justification for the proposed output of two policies. At least this should provide a context of how many policies may be required and a justification for why a target of two gender responsive policies is an adequate output.

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.

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.)