

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: 29 January 2010

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley

I. PIF Information

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4082 **PROJECT DURATION:** 48 months

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: P112668

COUNTRY: Angola

PROJECT TITLE: Angola: National Biodiversity Project

GEF AGENCY: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment, Department of Biodiversity, Provincial Government of Namibe Province

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM: BD-SP3-PA Networks

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency:
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP strongly supports this proposal. It is well formulated and realistic in its understanding of the challenges inherent in mobilising biodiversity conservation projects in a country that is recovering from a long period of civil war.
3. In the development of the full proposal, it is recommended that careful attention be given to the planning and approach to capacity building initiatives. Angola has very weak institutional and individual capacities in protected areas management and biodiversity assessment. Previous initiatives by donors have been too focused on meeting numerical targets (i.e. number of persons trained), rather than the quality and sustainability of the learning process. The objective of capacity building is more important than infrastructure building, but much more difficult. Sustained development of human capacity is a long process, not an event, and the proposal needs to spell out how and by whom, and for whom, this will be achieved.
4. Reference is made to the inclusion of local communities in the development and implementation of management plans for Iona National Park. It is not clear how this will be achieved, given the special nature of the nomadic, pastoral, Ovahimba people who are the major occupants of Iona and its limited water and rangeland resources, and few of whom speak Portuguese. Lessons learned from other GEF projects involving the inclusion of indigenous minority communities living within Protected Areas should be studied in the PPG phase.
5. Limited information is given on the global biodiversity benefits expected from the project. This reflects the very weak biodiversity information base available for Angola as a whole. The capacity building component of the project needs to address capacity needs not only in overall project management and conservation management, but also in the development of biodiversity assessment and monitoring expertise among Angolan nationals.

<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>