

# 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: April 14, 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:** 5516

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Mozambique

**PROJECT TITLE:** Payment for Ecosystem Services to Support Forest Conservation and Sustainable Livelihoods

**GEF AGENCIES:** FAO

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of the Coordination of Environmental Affairs National Directorate of Environmental Management Ministry of Agriculture National Directorate of Land and Forests Ministry of Tourism (National Directorate of Conservation Areas)

**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):  
**Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the submission of this well thought through and clearly presented concept for a project intending to promote biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation through the development and implementation of a PES scheme in miombo ecosystems. The PES scheme is intended to support the conservation of forests and wildlife and help improve local peoples' livelihoods. As noted in the submission, this is an updated resubmission of a 2007 FAO/Government of Mozambique PIF.

The Objective is clear, and the structure of the project framework is logical and demonstrates coherence among its elements. It is noted that indicators and targets will be developed during the PPG stage.

The overall problem and the threats and barriers are described clearly and effectively. The baseline is presented well and clearly offers much for the project to build upon. The transitioning between pages 6/7, 7/8 and 8/9 is disjointed, however, and should be rectified going forward. The incremental cost reasoning and explanation is sound. The GEBs in three focal areas are clearly defined. The project's innovative character and the prospects for its sustainability and scaling-up potential, which is high, are described well and are well reasoned. The key stakeholders are presented as are their roles. The principal risks and proposed mitigation measures are also well presented, although the level of risk is not identified. This project has clear linkages with other ongoing projects but the specific mechanism and processes to ensure effective coordination with them will need to be defined and agreed upon during the PPG.

STAP is keen to ensure that this mainstreaming effort also makes a tangible contribution to the growing evidence base for how these types of initiatives (i.e. payment schemes for ecosystem services) can generate data which clearly demonstrates how these initiatives support the delivery of biodiversity related global environmental benefits in a coherent, measurable fashion. The Panel wishes to bring to the attention of the proponents a recent publication of STAP which addresses this issue specifically: Payments for Environmental Services and the Global Environment Facility (2010) - <http://www.stapgef.org/payments-for-environmental-services-and-the-global-environment-facility/>. In addition, STAP will publish revised guidelines for successful biodiversity mainstreaming in May 2014, and urges the proponents to consult this guidance in the development of the final project document.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	<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>
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<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"> <li>(i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions.</li> <li>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<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"> <li>(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.</li> <li>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</li> </ul>