

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 21, 2014

Screeener: Paul Grigoriev

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz

Consultant(s): Thomas Hammond

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5486

PROJECT DURATION : 7

COUNTRIES : Madagascar

PROJECT TITLE: A Landscape Approach to Conserving and Managing Threatened Biodiversity in Madagascar with a Focus on the Atsimo-Andrefana Spiny and Dry Forest Landscape

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment and Forests (MEF) and "Fondation TANY MEVA" in collaboration with SAGE

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):
@@@@@@@@@@

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP welcomes the submission of this concept for an important project intended to mainstream biodiversity conservation and management into existing and emerging development sectors and to contain pressures in a realistic fashion in the most ecologically sensitive areas, including protected areas (PAs) and their adjacent zones, by respectively strengthening resource use governance at the landscape level and conservation on communal lands.

The project concept is clearly well thought through as evidenced by the logic and coherence of its components. The title and objective are clear and consistent with the described problem. Regarding the presented Outcome indicators, some of them could be reworded (e.g. conversion of natural habitats for agriculture is significantly reduced in CCAs) to make them more focused "to rate of conversion. Some clearer alignment of the Outputs with the defined barriers could also be pursued during the PPG phase. For example, while access to available information on biodiversity is defined as a barrier, addressing this barrier is not clearly reflected in the proposed Outputs.

The existing and developing threats and pressures and root causes are well presented, and the context of the project is thoroughly described. The description of the baseline conditions is comprehensive, and the fit/nesting of the proposed project with baseline activities is well presented. The barrier definition is sound, and looking ahead, although the specific barriers ought to become more reflected in the proposed activities as per the observation above. The incremental cost reasoning is well presented but more details will be expected following the PPG phase. The GEBs are well documented. The innovative aspects of the proposed project are noted and accepted. Concerning the sustainability of the project's results, however, more information could be provided even at this preliminary stage. Regarding the project's scaling up, the potential is clearly there but external support will undoubtedly be required. It is beneficial to see the attention devoted to the issue of gender and the recognition of the role of women in local communities and the project's implementation. The definition of stakeholders is comprehensive along with engagement of local communities "their roles in the project are also clearly defined.

Regarding risks, what is presented is a comprehensive appraisal of the magnitude of the defined risks. Climate change related risks, however, are not mentioned. STAP urges that climate risks be addressed explicitly during the PPG stage.

Coordination with other activities and initiatives is well described but the specifics concerning the mechanism and process will need to be determined as part of the PPG work.

<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: (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.</p>
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: (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.</p>