

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: May 03, 2013

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5368

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Guinea-Bissau

PROJECT TITLE: Strengthening the Financial and Operational Framework of the National PA System in Guinea-Bissau

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Institute for Biodiversity and Protected Areas (IBAP) of the State Secretariat for Environment and Tourism (SEAT). Directorate General for Forests and Fauna (DGFF) of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD).

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

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): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP welcomes this important but extremely challenging project. A sound case is made for contributing to the conservation of the remnant blocks of the forest remnants in Guinea Bissau and thereby completing the representative coverage of the country's key ecosystems within its PA system. The forests of West Africa are critically endangered, and the inclusion of the forests of Guinea Bissau in effectively managed PAs is of high priority.

2. The PIF Project Framework outcomes indicate that METT and other tracking tools will be used to monitor performance, supported by capacity building programmes for PA staff. The footnote statement that Cantanhez NP already had a METT score of 49 in 2009 suggests that either this score is generous or that the proposed 50% increase during project implementation is unrealistic.

STAP suggests that care be taken in evaluating METT baselines and that during PPG these be re-assessed for the Guinea Bissau PA system as a whole, ensuring objectivity during the process.

3. The PIF is well presented and provides a clear description of the challenges and risks attending the proposed interventions. Both financial and institutional challenges are addressed, with the establishment of a UK-based Trust Fund with international audit protocols as a critical key element.

STAP considers that the statement on root causes and barriers is comprehensive, but understates the significant governance challenges and political vulnerability of implementing complex projects in Guinea Bissau – which ranks 179 out of a global 185 countries in terms of the ease of doing business. It is suggested that the vulnerability of project implementation be more cautiously considered during PPG.

Failure of establishing and capitalizing this Trust Fund would place the whole project, and biodiversity conservation in Guinea Bissau, at risk. STAP recommends that the establishment and capitalization of the TF be given high priority during PPG.

4. The PIF identifies the critical need for full coordination and mutual cooperation between IBAB and DGFF. The problems of overlapping and competing responsibilities of government institutions involved in wildlife and protected areas management is endemic in former Portuguese colonies, and continues to frustrate donor efforts in these countries. The project wisely identifies the need for special attention to resolving the problems resulting from this.

As in the case of the Trust Fund, the need for resolution of the relationship between IBAB and DGFF is critical. The many technical and capacity issues will remain intractable unless the tensions between IBAB and DGFF are resolved.

STAP recommends that high-level intervention be prioritized to address this issue during PPG.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</p>
3. Major revision required	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up: (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>