

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: 5 June 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3687

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 4172

COUNTRY (IES): Madagascar

PROJECT TITLE: Network of Managed Resource Protected Areas

GEF AGENCY (IES): UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: FANAMBY, Ministry of Environment, Waters & Forests, and Tourism (MEEFT), Ministère auprès de la Présidence chargé de la Décentralisation et de l'Aménagement du Territoire (MPrDAT), ASITY

GEF FOCAL AREAS: Biodiversity: (SO 1: Protected Areas)

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM (S): BD-SP3: Strengthening National Terrestrial PA Systems

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: NA

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 the proposal "Network of Managed Resource Protected Areas" in Madagascar. The proposal is scientifically and technically sound, written clearly, identifies clear global environment benefits, and states briefly how the benefits will be measured. The proposal is also innovative insofar as that it proposes to work with extractive industries (mining and oil) to establish biodiversity offset arrangements. For this arrangement to work successfully, it will be important to work with the industry to establish a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system that can help ensure the desired conservation outcomes are being achieved, and that the impacts are being fully offset. The proponents could strengthen their proposal by thinking about ways to induce some variation in where (or when) the new protected areas are established that is not related to the environmental outcomes to be monitored (e.g., variation that is not related to deforestation pressure). This kind of variation (e.g., choosing the first sites to initiate PAs or initiate capacity building of local communities at random from the set of eligible sites) will allow for more credible testing of the relative effectiveness of these new protected areas in delivering environmental benefits. The evidence claimed for the success of the Anjozorobe Forest Corridor is not sufficient to justify rolling out of the program throughout the country without further (and better) evaluation of co-managed PA effectiveness. Such evidence would not only benefit Madagascar, but the many initiatives throughout the world that are attempting to decentralize natural resource management. STAP would be available to assist the project in thinking about such a component to their project.

<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.	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:

	<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>
<p>3. Major revision required</p>	<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>