

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: May 03, 2013

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5225

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Mozambique

PROJECT TITLE: Mozambique Conservation Areas for Biodiversity and Development Project

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Tourism of Mozambique

GEF FOCAL AREA: Multi Focal Area

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): **Major revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP notes the ambitious and complex objectives of this large project which seeks \$101 million from donors, (excluding investment by the Government of Mozambique). STAP finds certain aspects of the proposal weak, due to limitations in the information provided. Throughout the proposal reference is made to information being added through work to be undertaken during project development, which is understandable in a situation of limited data availability, but estimates of certain parameters might be possible through more thorough analysis of available sources.

STAP recommends that the concept note be revised in the light of specific weaknesses noted below.

2. This project is listed as Multi-Focal Area project, but it only addresses GEF 5 strategic objective BD 1. 'Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems'. Although it is stated (#15) that the project contributes to the Climate Change focal area strategic objective, further reference to CC is very cursory. CC is not mentioned in the Draft Results framework, but is noted briefly in the draft project description under component 3 Conservation Area Management.

STAP recommends that the Climate Change component of the project should be more clearly described and the manner in which this will be implemented more fully detailed.

3. The project anticipates tourism as the driver of its financial sustainability (and that of the PA system), but notes that 'most terrestrial conservation areas do not yet have sufficiently attractive products, or a level of public infrastructure, to scale up tourism'. It is therefore a long-term investment, and thus the requested six-year time frame for the project is appropriate.

STAP considers that the proposal to expand the PA development programme to include large investments in up to seven more PAs, before the results of the ambitious TFCA projects and that at Gorongosa have been fully evaluated, is premature. Very little reference is made to lessons learned from the past ten years of investment in the TFCA programme, other than the statement that the TFCA Implementation Unit has demonstrated satisfactory implementation of TFCA II. STAP recommends that in revision of the PCN, the lessons learned during TFCA I & II be indicated and proposals made on how such challenges will be addressed in this new project.

4. The World Bank Project Concept Note does not indicate Global Environmental Benefits (although reference is made to 'globally significant biodiversity including some iconic wildlife' this is not identified), nor is the Baseline Project

described, making evaluation of the biodiversity conservation targets and the context of similar initiatives in Mocambique difficult.

STAP requests that a stronger case be made on the global environmental benefits to be expected from this project, and more specific information be given on the biodiversity values of the seven target PAs.

5. The Development Objective (strengthen effective management of PAs and their contribution to the diversification of economic opportunities) has five major outcomes, but none of these are quantified nor are targets set against which to measure performance of the \$100 million investment.

STAP recommends that the revised concept note provide some quantification of targets and indicators.

6. Key risks are described in some detail. Significantly, the proposal indicates that neither the implementing institution (ANAC) nor the Trust Fund are yet in operation. (#25 “The institution is not functioning yet as the core staff has not been selected. There is a risk that the selection of staff might not be performance- based but the GoM might transfer their current government officials from other agencies to ANAC irrespective of their performance and qualifications.”).

It is further proposed (#29) that the existing TFCA Unit be engaged as the implementing team “The TFCAU masters all dimension of project implementation as demonstrated by the satisfactory status of TFCA II implementation.’ This might be a short-term solution to the capacity and institutional challenges, as emphasised in #36 “given that the proposed project will largely implement a reform that is not yet fully completed is substantial: for example, ANAC is not yet fully established, the Conservation Bill has not reached parliament, tourism concessions in conservation areas are not yet satisfactorily regulated and there are unsorted overlapping mandates in marine conservation areas.’

Given the serious risks noted in the PCN, STAP suggests it might be prudent to develop a more modest proposal with clear and achievable objectives at this stage of the development of national institutions.

7. It is noted that the project will include involuntary resettlement of households living in the PAs. While reference is made to the application of World Bank safeguards, reported experience in the Limpopo TFCA indicates that such resettlements might be extremely difficult.

STAP suggests that an alternative scenario to involuntary resettlement is offered, or at least the possibility of such be considered in the PCN.

8. The institutional arrangements are very briefly mentioned, without an organogram which would help understand the relationship between MITUR, ANAC, DNAC, BioFund, their responsibilities and coordinating mechanisms. Further, the relationship between the proposed project and the TFCA Phase III project is not described.

STAP requests that the relationship between the key institutions be more clearly described, and the mechanisms to overcome existing overlaps and potential tensions between these be detailed.

9. The Draft Results Framework provides no indication of how the numerous indicators will be measured. STAP recommends that clarity be given on this point in the revised PCN.

For the above reasons, STAP recommends that the PCN be revised to reflect the additional precision required for a reasonable assessment of expected GEBs.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	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. 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.
2. Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development. 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.
3. Major revision	STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.

required	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.
-----------------	---