

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response	
GEF ID		
Project Title	Strengthening Community-managed Protected Areas for Conserving Biodiversity and Improving Local Livelihoods in Pakistan	
Date of Screening	May 18 2020	
STAP member screener	Rosie Cooney	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Concur</p> <p>STAP welcomes the project from UNDP entitled “Strengthening Community-managed Protected Areas for Conserving Biodiversity and Improving Local Livelihoods in Pakistan.”</p> <p>STAP feels that this is a sound project building on decades of experience of community-based management in Pakistan. It recognizes the limitations of relying on government action for conservation in remote areas and relies on empowering local communities and creating an enabling environment for them to benefit from and effectively and sustainably manage resources.</p> <p>While the project remains vague across a number of domains, and planning requires considerable strengthening in a number of areas (e.g. TOC, climate risk screening, learning lessons from other projects), the basics appear sound, build-in innovation, and are well-designed to deliver the intended outcomes.</p>	
Part I: Project Information B. Indicative Project Description Summary	What STAP looks for	Response
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Generally, the objective emerges clearly in the project, although it is not stated particularly clearly, and it is directly related to the problem diagnosis (although the problem diagnosis is rather incomplete – see below). The focus on co-management and community-based natural resource management is very welcome, as is the

		<p>approach of shifting incentives for local actors in relation to wildlife and natural resources. This approach directly targets the loss/degradation of natural habitats, poaching, etc. highlighted in the problem statement.</p> <p>Note that the objective is framed as promoting improved governance OF INRM in some places and improved governance AND INRM at different points – as these are different things consistency would be preferable.</p>
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	The text is quite unclear whether/when it is talking about co-management of (state-based) PAs and when it is talking about community management of resources on community-owned/managed lands. The two seem to be conflated throughout, which is very confusing.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
1. Project description. Briefly describe: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined?	The proximate problems are well described, but the root causes are not clarified in any detail. The barrier 3 – particularly economic incentives – appears to be actually a root cause. Do communities have the secure long-term rights to own/manage/benefit from wild plants and animals that would be a fundamental precondition to support sustainable (rather than

		<p>unsustainable/illegal) use, for example? Do they have the ability to effectively exclude use by outsiders (e.g. of timber)? These are fundamental institutional conditions (related to property rights) for sustainable resource management. As this project directly tackles these institutional factors, spelling them out in the problem statement is important.</p> <p>(Note that the reference to institutional aspects in barriers does not tackle these property rights issues.) The problem statement does not address rights (to own/manage land/resources/wild species) at all, and yet these are fundamental in structuring incentives to manage.</p> <p>STAP document Local Commons, Global Benefits addresses these issues and would provide very relevant and useful input for this project https://www.stapgef.org/local-commons-global-benefits-indigenous-and-community-based-management-wild-species-forests-and</p>
	<p>Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?</p>	<p>Not all the time. For instance, in barrier 1 the text says “Many institutional, legal, and policy gaps in their effective management are identified that need to be urgently addressed through capacity building”. But capacity building builds capacity – it doesn’t address legal and policy gaps. There is a lack of precision in setting out the project logic here and at a number of points. In Barrier 2 the text says community-based conservation was introduced as a concept 20 years ago – but what about the Torghar STEP project? It involves fully community-led conservation and has been operational since the 1980s. See Woodford, M.H. et al., (2004). The Torghar conservation project: Management of the livestock, Suleiman</p>

		<p>markhor (<i>Capra falconeri</i>) and Afghan urial (<i>Ovis orientalis</i>) in the Torghar Hills, Pakistan. <i>Game and Wildlife Science</i>. 21. 177-187.</p> <p>In Barrier 4, the point that the conservation benefits of trophy hunting are poorly understood is an important one – this is not just a local/national issue but an international one (if foreign hunters stop coming, or their countries of origin do not allow trophy imports, these programs will collapse). Note that there is considerable documentation on some CB-trophy hunting programs, but gaining recognition is not just a question of providing information, but of changing mindsets and ideological barriers. Overall, indeed most barriers here would be better framed as root causes of the problem. Barriers to change would be what obstacles face efforts to address these e.g. entrenched interest groups, remoteness, political instability, etc.</p>
	For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?	
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Numerous past/ongoing/planned projects are identified. However, in terms of clearly identifying the baseline scenario in terms of community-based management/co-management, its success/failures in conservation terms and the challenges it is facing, this was not clearly identified.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	No – see above.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	This is not particularly clear.
	For multiple focal area projects:	

	are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	No, no lessons from past projects (or current practices of CB management) are included. The PIF simply states that lessons will be learnt. It would be reassuring for the planners to demonstrate that they have already learnt lessons in designing this project.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	N/A
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	There is a graphic TOC included, but it is not very clear, specific or useful as a planning tool. This is because it simply lists all the project components arranged under headings, without clarifying the internal logic of the project. The TOC should tell us, for example, which outputs contribute to which outcomes, and which activities contribute to which outputs. It should also give us a sense of the order in which things must happen i.e. which outcomes/outputs are dependent on other ones being achieved. A sound TOC should also identify risks and assumptions that underlie each progression from one step to the next. The STAP primer on TOCs is recommended to provide useful guidance on making a more useful and robust TOC.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	The components are generally clear and reasonably well articulated, and they do appear to collectively lead to the desired outcomes. In component 3, the text talks about the community owning the process of conservation and SU, but then goes on to say they aren't spending their income "properly" and need to be guided as to what to spend money on (e.g. conservation) by governments and NGOs.

		<p>The project can't have it both ways – either it is genuine community empowerment/ownership of the process or NGOs/government are telling them what decisions to make. It would seem the former would be much more likely to gain community buy-in and have durable outcomes.</p> <p>With component 4, this policymaker/public awareness-raising is important, but note the enormous NGO/public backlash against wildlife trade and the major challenges here. (Movement of trophies counts as wildlife trade under CITES and domestic rules).</p> <p>It is not clear this has been well thought-through even within WCS, as the global message from WCS is “Stop wildlife trade”. While few large organizations are totally consistent in their messaging, it would be good to see in this PIF some indication that the challenges facing CB trophy hunting (primarily from NGOs) as a conservation tool in coming years have been adequately appreciated.</p>
	<p>What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?</p>	<p>These are relatively clear, though not clearly and logically linked in the TOC. This is made much clearer in Table 1, and it would be good to see this content incorporated into the TOC. In Table 1, however, again, there is no mention of rights. Surely the whole emphasis here should be on empowering local stakeholders to manage wildlife/NRs? This should be made clearer. Rights are very different to capacity.</p>
	<p>Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?</p>	<p>No, this is not clear. While the project says it will develop a MEL strategy to facilitate adaptive management of the project, there is no specificity on what adaptations may be required.</p>

5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Yes, this is well-justified.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Yes
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	This is not made clear.
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	Yes, to some extent the approach of empowering communities and enabling them to benefit from wildlife/NRs is innovative (or rather an old idea that is generally poorly understood and rarely applied). The potential engagement of the private sector is innovative.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes, this is fairly clear.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The project is aiming at transformational change – shifting underlying incentives of local people in relation to biodiversity.

<p>1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.</p>		
<p>2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	
	<p>What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?</p>	<p>The stakeholder roles will be defined during project preparation. There appears to have been solid consultation of key stakeholders to this point. With respect to engagement with private sector, it is important to clarify that communities should exercise all decisions as to whether to work with private sector and with whom they choose to work. The text reads in some points as if the project will make these decisions.</p>
<p>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Yes, these appear clear and adequate.</p>

<p>relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/tbd.</p> <p>If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services.</p> <p>Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no/tbd</p>		
	<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be</p>	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control? Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project? For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately? • Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed? 	<p>The climate risk screening is not robust. There is no assessment of specific likely climate impacts in the project areas out to 2050, and how these will affect shifts of key species subject to utilization in the project, agricultural patterns, ecosystem health, etc. There is no assessment of sensitivity/vulnerability to these impacts, and no exploration of measures to promote resilience in the face of likely changes. The project indicates much of this will be done in later stages of</p>

<p>further developed during the project design</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with? • What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures? 	<p>planning, but this sort of assessment should inform initial project design.</p> <p>As indicated above, the risks to trophy carriage and import may be substantially underestimated. For example, both Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan have recently seen NGO pushes to ban trophy hunting, and at the global level and within CITES the strength of these movements is ever-increasing, driven by simplistic, non-science-based, and broad-brush messaging that ignores the benefits of wildlife trade under sound management arrangements (see under “What is the sequence of events....” above).</p>
<p>6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives</p>	<p>Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?</p>	<p>While at a general level this project builds on the success of community-managed trophy hunting projects/programs, there is little attempt to draw out specific lessons – both on what to do and what not to do – from previous experiences or projects.</p>
	<p>Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?</p>	<p>No, see above.</p>
	<p>Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?</p>	<p>No, see above.</p>
	<p>How have these lessons informed the project’s formulation?</p>	<p>See above.</p>
	<p>Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?</p>	<p>The text simply states that lessons will be learned from previous projects.</p>
<p>8. Knowledge management. Outline the “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project, and how it will contribute to the project’s overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.</p>	<p>What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?</p>	<p>Knowledge management remains quite vague at this point. It relies heavily on online forms – are the local communities that are key actors here all networked and able to access these? While reference to production in local languages is highlighted as desirable, this would seem to be an essential step.</p>

What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	See above.
--	------------

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
1. Concur	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. 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.
	* In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that <i>“STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design.”</i>
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	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.

3. Major issues to be considered during project design	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 proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.