

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: 7 October 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3741

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: PIMS 4173

COUNTRY (IES): Namibia

PROJECT TITLE: NAMIBIA Protected Landscape Conservation Areas Initiative (NAM-PLACE)

GEF AGENCY (IES): UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), Directorates of Tourism, and Parks and Wildlife Management (DoT, DPWM)

GEF FOCAL AREAS: Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM (S): SO1/SP3: Strengthened National Terrestrial Protected Area Networks

Name of Parent Program/ Umbrella Project: Not Applicable

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP welcomes this proposal on Protected landscape conservation areas initiative in Namibia. However, STAP would like to draw UNDP's attention to the following suggestions to improve the proposal.
3. The PCLA is a zoning concept to promote landscape management for biodiversity through "co-management" with local stakeholders. Such approaches are popular globally, but there is little empirical evidence that they generate substantial incremental gains in environmental (or human welfare) outcomes. Given that this program will be implemented on a pilot basis, project proponents should consider if there are ways to roll out the program in ways that will make it easier to determine program effectiveness (e.g., establishing boundaries of PCLA based on criteria that are uncorrelated with wildlife outcomes, thereby allowing one to compare changes in wildlife numbers at independent sampling sites inside and outside PCLAs). STAP is willing to advise UNDP in considering whether such a program design would be feasible.
4. The weakest part of this proposal is the description of how local land users will be enticed to participate in, and comply with the rules of, the PCLAs. By restricting uses and creating additional management costs, local land users will clearly incur costs, but the potential benefits to participation and compliance are only vaguely described. STAP hopes that the full project brief will clarify the potential incentives in greater detail.
5. The PIF does not indicate to what extent there is a need, if any, to strengthen land security in the pilot sites for the management approaches to succeed.
6. A "paradigm shift" would seem to be a hard outcome to define, much less measure.
7. The PIF notes that capacity on adaptation management to deal with climate change will be needed in the PLCAs. Given that the role that dispersal corridors will play in a future climate change-affected Namibia, is the PLCA the appropriate unit for building capacity to address climate change adaptation needs for biodiversity? If it is, one potential source for knowledge on adaptation capacity could be the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), which is currently implementing a project on climate change in Africa - with a focus on research and capacity building on adaptation management <http://www.idrc.ca/ccaa/>

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review <p>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.</p>
3. Major revision required	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>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.</p>