

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: February 20, 2014

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz

Consultant(s): Paul Grigoriev

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5537

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Congo

PROJECT TITLE: Creation of Conkouati Dimonika PA Complex and Development of Community Private Sector Participation Model to Enhance PA Management Effectiveness CDC&CPSPM

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Division of Nature Conservation, Ministry of Tourism and Environment

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):

Minor revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP welcomes the submission of this concept for a project intended to conserve globally significant biodiversity values through the creation of a complex of protected areas and to improve management effectiveness of the protected areas through the participation and collaboration of local communities and the private sector.

The structure, in general, is logical in terms of the relations between the objective and proposed outcomes and outputs. However, certain areas can be improved upon. The objective sounds very hopeful or optimistic by using the term "secure". In certain places, it does become somewhat confusing and not too easy to follow. Some outputs and indicators mirror each other. This requires revisiting and clarification. For Outcome 1.1, either management effectiveness should be removed and put under Component 2 or outputs related to improving management effectiveness should be included under Component 1. The former seems preferable. Outcomes 1.1 and 2.1 overlap regarding management effectiveness as presented now. It is noted that METT is not included in the framework yet and it certainly should be. At the same time, there are too many "indicators" presented. A good number of them are also not really indicators. Some of the indicators could really be activities or outputs (e.g. map prepared). Output 1.1.1 is rather ambiguous by stating "at least 1" PA will be created. This needs clarity since this has implications for project design and budget. While not affecting the framework, the proposal has numerous typos as well which ought to be corrected moving forward. Output 3.1.4 (ecological connectivity inâ€¦ is understood and maintained) in the text on p.9 does not appear in the framework table. One has to question how this can be an output as well, especially under Component 3.

The description of the problem is somewhat general and superficial. There is no satisfactory discussion of the root causes to be addressed. Nevertheless, the barriers are presented adequately but they should be reflected more clearly in the framework. A table indicating the relationship between the barriers and the specific Outcomes and Outputs would help clarify and present this essential relationship.

The baseline description is comprehensive. The GEBs are presented but their realization must become more explicitly related to project specifics. The whole section on them can be tightened up, for example, the mention of whales, dolphins and other globally-important marine species is hardly relevant to the project at hand. The incremental cost reasoning could be made clearer in terms of the specific relationship to GEBs and what the GEBs will actually be delivered. The project possesses a measure of innovation for the

country. However, the presented basis for its sustainability is not particularly convincing and will require further elaboration. The project does have scaling-up potential but this also will require further development. The stakeholders are well defined but the specific roles of the government ministries should be clearly identified.

The definition and assessment of risks is reasonable although risk 3 is unclear (a mix of environmental management plans and Ebola virus). Climate "resilience" is mistakenly (?) presented as a risk instead of climate change. A number of the proposed mitigation measures require more thought and refinement to make them more realistic and capable of being implemented to lessen risk exposure and improve risk management.

Concerning coordination with other projects and initiatives, of which there is a good number, information will need to be provided about the actual mechanism(s) and process(es) to be instituted to ensure that the required coordination does occur effectively.

Although the involvement of the private sector is considered a good strategy in this case, it is not clear how this is going to contribute to conservation. Some of the main activities of the private sector (e.g. mining) are identified as major drivers of biodiversity deterioration and direct threat to key species in the area. The specific examples of engagement of the private sector mentioned in the proposal are mostly related to mitigation (e.g. provision of funding for environmental initiatives), rather than targeting the direct drivers themselves. The characteristics of this engagement and some concrete examples of how it will decrease pressure on the system certainly deserve more detailed analysis. Related to this, the conflicts mentioned in Output 2.1.4, and how are they going to be addressed, need to be explained in more detail.

Considering the importance given to poaching as a driver of biodiversity loss in the region, more details of the indirect drivers of this activity, and how the project will deal with them, is in order. At the moment, the emphasis seems to be on stronger enforcement against offenders and in the development of rather vague "anti-poaching activities". Will the project address some of the root causes that fuel poaching? If so, how, in the most concrete possible terms?

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<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. Minor revision required.	<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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.
3. Major revision required	<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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.