

REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022

GEF ID	11626
Project title	Effective protection of Mozambique's Miombo woodlands and marine hotspot conservation areas enhancing global coping mechanisms to climate change
Date of screen	20 June 2025
STAP Panel Member	Sandy Andelman
STAP Secretariat	Alessandro Moscuza

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

The project has the potential to make significant contributions to Mozambique's commitments to both the GBF and the Miombo Declaration, through the protection of miombo woodlands in Gilé National Park (GNAP) and its buffer zone. GNAP has significant areas of high-integrity miombo woodland and it is the only national park in Mozambique that is uninhabited by people. The project also has potential to contribute to Mozambique's marine protected area (MPA) targets to the GBF through expansion of individual or the network of MPAs. The project aligns closely with the strategic priorities of the GBF and it proposes to support several GBF targets: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23. However, the project would be strengthened by reducing the number of specific targets and by providing a clear rationale for its contributions to each one, as described in the Section 3 of this screen. The project would also be strengthened by providing an explicit strategy for scaling up impacts under the Miombo Declaration to the national-scale and to the entire miombo region.

The Theory of Change - both the diagram and the narrative - would be improved by clarifying several issues and by providing clear pathways from barriers, to interventions, to outputs or midterm outcomes, to long-term impacts. The suggested changes are provided in Section 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
- ☐ **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 project rationale and description provide a good analysis of the underlying environmental, institutional, and socio-economic issues the project aims to address, as well as the outcomes it intends to achieve, although generally at a national level, rather than at the level of the specific land- and seascapes where it will focus. The project seems to have missed an opportunity to take an explicitly integrative, systems-based approach.

Mozambique is a conflict-affected country. The likelihood of achieving robust and durable project outcomes would be increased with explicit consideration of scenario-based or future narratives frameworks. Currently, there is no structured consideration of multiple, diverging futures (e.g. "best case", "business-as-usual", "worst case"), nor is there consideration of how the proposed interventions might perform under different scenarios.

The project would also be strengthened by clarifying several issues in the Theory of Change – both the diagram and the narrative. The specific suggested changes are described in Section 3 below.

The project presents a description of the planned approach to stakeholder engagement, covering actors at the local, national, and regional levels. It identifies a reasonably comprehensive range of relevant stakeholders, including government entities such as the Ministry of Land and Environment (MTA), the National Administration for Conservation Areas (ANAC), and non-state actors such as local and international NGOs, research institutions, and community cooperatives. This aspect of the proposal could be significantly improved by providing more details about the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder during the project implementation phase, including in the institutional arrangements. A description of how the project will ensure that different stakeholders work together effectively in an integrated manner would also be useful. In the current version of the proposal, there is some broad indication of plans to promote multi-stakeholder dialogue through platforms and coordination mechanisms, such as the Miombo Declaration. However, these plans are very broad and do not demonstrate or explain how the project will add value to existing initiatives and mechanisms. A stakeholder consultation report, with further details about the stakeholder consultation process, is provided in an annex. However, some of the input from this consultation does not seem to have been used in developing the project. For example both ANAC and the GNAP chief park warden seemed to suggest that reforestation is essential for the project, however, reforestation was not included in the project and the reason is not clear.

The assessment of climate hazards does not consider [drought](#), which is significant, both in the project area and nationally.

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

-The project would be strengthened by explicitly considering how it will ensure durable outcomes in the face of future uncertainties, such as droughts, flooding, cyclones, political instability, risk of insurgency, and potential economic shocks, and the current situation with respect to ODA. [STAP's guidance on Simple Future Narratives](#) may be helpful.

-The ToC narrative should provide an explanation of how institutional and behavioral changes will be achieved, how adaptive capacity will be built, and how risks will be managed throughout the implementation process to ensure long-term durability of the project results. The assumptions should also be made more explicit, especially in the ToC diagram. The [STAP Theory of Change Primer](#) provides guidance on all of these aspects.

-Ensure that the description of the project components explain how behavioral change will be achieved and that this will be integrated as a desirable outcome of proposed project activities and interventions. [STAP advisory documents on why behavioral change matters to the GEF and what to do about it](#) can offer useful insights on this topic.

-Risks to the long-term durability of project outcomes resulting from systemic or future external drivers should ideally be incorporated into the project logic and design rather than detailed in the risk table. For this proposal, the risks identified under the Climate, Political and Governance, and Institutional and Policy categories fall under this purview. [STAP's advice on clarifying risks in GEF projects](#) provides additional guidance on this aspect of risk assessment and analysis.

-The proponent should clarify the project's intended contributions to, and rationale for, specific GBF targets. Based on the Table starting on p. 92, the project will contribute to several GBF Targets: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23. This list should be reviewed and potentially reduced. A clear rationale and measures for evaluating how the project will contribute to each target are needed. The following are some illustrative examples, but this list is not exhaustive:

- Spatial planning is a key element of Target 1. Currently, applying spatial planning is mentioned in outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 3.1, and 3.2; however, the description of how this will be accomplished is support for spatial planning from RCMRD. The rationale for why RCMRD was selected and what they will do should be provided, especially since Mozambique is not a member of RCMRD.
- Target 2: Target 2 is about restoring 30% of degraded areas by 2030. STAP suggests this target be removed from the project since Indicator 3 (area of land and ecosystems under restoration) has been removed. Also, the prodoc mentions that restoration has been removed from the activities. It is unclear how the project is relevant to Target 2. If the decision is to include Target 2, at a minimum, a baseline needs to be calculated for the total degraded area within GNAP, and separately, within the buffer zone. It should not be assumed that fire prevention and fire management will contribute to restoration. More details are needed, since natural fires are crucial for the dynamics of miombo.
- Target 3. Clarify whether and where individual marine protected areas will be expanded or where new ones will be added.
- Target 4 is about reducing the extinction risk of known threatened species. Three threatened species are mentioned in the prodoc: *Libinia ferrea*, *Afzelia quanzensis*, and *Pterocarpus angolensis*; however, the IUCN Red List currently designates *Afzelia quanzensis* as Least Concern¹ (that is, while monitoring these species is important, the population is stable and widespread enough and is currently considered to have a lower risk of extinction). Five species of sea turtles are also mentioned as threatened. If these are to be a target, then there needs to be a baseline estimate of extinction risk and proposed actions, e.g., protecting nests on beaches, need to be described.
- Target 5. STAP suggests removing agriculture from this target, since the target is about the sustainable and legal use of wild species. If NTFP value chains are to be included for this target, then specific mushroom species, not just mushrooms generically, need to be specified, and a mechanism for estimating sustainable harvest levels needs to be included.
- Target 19: Suggest removing the reference to the governance mechanism for the Miombo Declaration. This target should only be included if the project will include specific actions to mobilize resources for biodiversity conservation under the Miombo Declaration. Additionally, the proponent should clarify whether approximately \$76,800K in financing on its own represents a “substantial and progressive” increase in financing from all sources, as is expected under Target 19.

-The EU funded a project from 2015-2019 in GNAP on “Strengthening of financial sustainability and biodiversity of Gilé National Reserve – Mozambique.” This project is not mentioned in Table 4, but is directly relevant current project.

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

¹ <https://www.iucnredlist.org/fr/species/60757666/60757681>

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.)