

# 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: April 24, 2012

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams; Michael Anthony Stocking  
Consultant(s): Douglas Taylor

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4669

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Namibia

**PROJECT TITLE:** Namibian Coast Conservation and Management Project

**GEF AGENCIES:** World Bank

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Environment and Tourism

**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 revision required**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP welcomes this project which is intended to consolidate the achievements of NACOMA (GEF ID 1505) and to elaborate the anticipated White Paper on Coastal Policy of Namibia into practical ICZM. STAP makes a number of recommendations for improvements and clarifications to the project concept below that STAP requires be built on during formulation of the full project brief. The primary deficit is the lack of a clear justification for the project in terms of Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs). Achievement of an ICZM framed policy is an asset, however, GEF-relevant verifiable targets appear to be missing with regard to the application of ICZM.
2. In general ICZM is a well understood concept and the Green Paper for the Coastal Policy of Namibia (2009) referred to in the PIF references a number of useful and relevant sources. The process of developing ownership for the regulations and criteria for enforcement in any particular country is however a sensitive one, including the establishment and ownership of the state of the environment data and its interpretation. STAP notes and welcomes the intention of the project to collaborate with the principal regional coastal body the Benguela Current Commission.
3. Component 1: Community-based stakeholders appear not to have been explicitly included in the design for the training or outreach activities of this enabling component, although in the project narrative there is mention of community participation but no clear mechanism stated to achieve this aim. (STAP recognizes the very low human population currently present in this zone, however this could change over time). In particular STAP recommends that the proposed best environmental practices guidelines be developed along strongly participatory lines in order to gain community ownership for the necessary monitoring and its underpinning science that will drive the development of the laws and enforcement regime flowing from policy adoption.
4. Component 2: While STAP welcomes the intention of the project to strengthen two protected areas and rehabilitate community lands, it is unclear what the replication potential of these investments will be. For the LD sub-component it is unclear what Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) would result. STAP notes that some 200,000 ha of community land outside the protected area will be addressed for rehabilitation from land degradation, but no details are provided as to what will be done and how. It will be very important during project preparation to strategize carefully how this rehabilitation will proceed, what technologies will be applied and how local communities will be fully involved in decisions. There is a rich body of literature on the pitfalls and problems of dealing with common property resources in drylands (see in particular Elinor Ostrom). It will be essential to include best practice technologies, possibly using the WOCAT database, which highlights key issues such as costs and benefits of different approaches (see [www.wocat.net](http://www.wocat.net))

5. STAP also draws the project proponents attention to its advice provided to the recently launched GEF project (ID 3741) Namibia Protected Landscape Conservation Areas Initiative (NAM-PLACE). Both projects assume that communities will participate even though it is likely that opportunity costs are incurred by communities. Therefore it is important to specify the incentives available, including attention to land security within the communities targeted by the project. STAP therefore recommends close coordination with NAM-PLACE, which is cited in B6 of the PIF.

6. Component 3: Within this component STAP would expect to see details of the results indicators proposed. At present, across all components STAP cannot determine beyond the proposed protected area actions what GEBs are expected to result from the project and an M&E results framework which defines these is necessary.

#### References

Green Paper for the Coastal Policy of Namibia 2009.

[http://www.dlist.org/sites/default/files/doclib/The%20Green%20Paper%20\\_april%202009.pdf](http://www.dlist.org/sites/default/files/doclib/The%20Green%20Paper%20_april%202009.pdf)

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	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"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> 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 revision required</b>	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. 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.