

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: 10 November 2008

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

Full size project GEF Trust Fund

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3773

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: P113976

COUNTRY: MADAGASCAR

PROJECT TITLE: Support to the Madagascar Foundation for Protected Areas and Biodiversity

GEF AGENCY: World Bank,

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): BD-SP1 – PA Financing

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: N/A

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 for the GEF to invest in a trust fund to support the management of Madagascar's recently expanded protected area network. STAP advises the GEF Secretariat and project proponents to consider how one can ensure that the GEF funds do not simply substitute for Government of Madagascar funds that would have gone to the Protected Area system in the absence of the GEF investment (thereby freeing up funds for other expenditures). In other words, given money is fungible, what constraints exist to ensure the GEF investments do not "crowd out" government allocations to the PA system? There is a large public finance and development economics literature on aid fungibility (a phenomenon for which there is mixed empirical evidence depending on the context and empirical methods used). Thus the proponents should consider if some conditionality on the incremental spending is needed to ensure maximum effectiveness of the GEF investment. For example, one can tie the investment to an overall public expenditure program that provides adequate resources to the PA system. This program would be a negotiated agreement that ties fund disbursement to achievement of mutually agreed upon expenditure levels.
3. STAP advises that the new GEF investment requested in this PIF should not necessarily be tied to PAs in which the GEF invested in the past. Such a constraint would not likely be binding, given that trust fund money is fungible, and if it were binding (i.e., they were not expecting to spend that much on PAs funded by the GEF in the past), the GEF would be placing constraints on conservation expenditures that have no scientific justification. Funding should be spatially and temporally targeted based on the most current information about costs and benefits, not information from earlier project cycles.
4. If the GEF-Sec or the project proponent needs assistance in locating a trust fund expert to review the full project proposal, the STAP is willing to assist in locating this individual.

<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	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as

<p>required.</p>	<p>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>
<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>