

# 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: November 13, 2017  
Screener: Sarah Lebel  
Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking  
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9426
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Namibia
PROJECT TITLE:	Namibia Integrated Landscape Approach for Enhancing Livelihoods and Environmental Governance to Eradicate Poverty (NILALEG)
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) - Department of Environmental Affairs, in cooperation with Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF), Ministry of Poverty Eradication and Social Welfare (MPESW), and Ministry of Urban and Rural Development (MURD) - Directorate of Rural Development
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):  
**Minor issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the UNDP proposal "Namibia Integrated Landscape Approach for enhancing Livelihoods and Environmental Governance to eradicate poverty (NILALEG)". The objective of the project is to "promote an integrated landscape management approach in key agricultural and forest landscapes, reducing poverty through sustainable nature-based livelihoods, protecting and restoring forests as carbon sinks, and promoting Land Degradation Neutrality". STAP believes that the PIF is well developed scientifically and technically, although much is left to the PPG phase for developing appropriate methods and techniques to achieve the ambitious goal of INMR. To help strengthen the project as it progresses to its full development, STAP makes the following recommendations:

1. In refining the interventions and approaches to achieve Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) targets as established in the 2015 Namibia LDN Report, STAP encourages the project managers to consult the Land Degradation Neutrality Conceptual Framework developed by the UNCCD Science Policy Interface. More information on the uses and applications for the Conceptual Framework can be found here:  
<http://knowledge.unccd.int/knowledge-products-and-pillars/land-degradation-neutrality-ldn-conceptual-framework/land>

2. Under Component 3 it is proposed to pilot a public works programme for unemployed youth, aimed at exploring the potential for commercial farmers to pay for ecosystem services in the form of bush clearing of acacia. It would be important, to ensure the sustainability of such a scheme, to promote further skills development for the formerly unemployed youth who will participate in these trials. Based on the results of the experimental trials conducted here, it may be relevant to combine Output 3.5 with some aspects of Component 2 in relation to nature-based enterprises. For instance, should the trials bring positive results,

the transformation of acacia for animal feed could form an integral part of a nature-based enterprise which could potentially bring more sustainable employment to the participants than simple bush clearing.

3. Information, knowledge and communication outreach is mentioned in the Risk Table, and the PIF contains one paragraph of text under Knowledge Management (Section 7, pages 26-27). STAP notes the intention to develop a Communication and Knowledge Management (KM) Strategy during the PPG phase and to elaborate the mechanisms and approaches to be used. It is therefore disappointing that the Project Framework (Section B) makes no mention of KM or any intention to develop a suitable repository of information to inform upscaling and replication of lessons and techniques relevant to Namibia. The suitable place for this is under Component 3 where current outputs contain a miscellany of issues related to financing, investment opportunities and upscaling. STAP would have expected to have seen even at this early stage a much better focus on how the complex of interrelated issues in INRM and landscapes will be captured in order to inform future investments. Without a focus on information related to integration of biodiversity, land degradation, SFM and CCM, STAP fears that the reality of the project will simply be a piecemeal set of single-topic activities unrelated to the broader goal of building capacity in integrated landscape management. For further advice on developing KM systems suitable for GEF investments, the proponents are advised to consult STAP's recent advice to the GEF at <http://www.stagef.org/knowledge-management-gef> as well as more generic advice on KM systems such as at <http://www.knowledge-management-tools.net/knowledge-management-systems.html>

4. In Annex 3, estimated greenhouse gas mitigation benefits are presented using the FAO's EX-ACT tool. It is stated that the project should reduce emissions through agroforestry, sustainable timber extraction, and climate-smart agriculture, which is reflected in the calculations through the land use change deforestation component. However, a significant component of the project, is the restoration of degraded land (e.g. mitigating bush encroachment of grasslands). Mitigation benefits of such interventions should also be considered.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:  (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.  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.
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:  (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.  The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.  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.