

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: November 02, 2017
Screener: Guadalupe Duron
Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9400
PROJECT DURATION:	6
COUNTRIES:	Tanzania
PROJECT TITLE:	Safeguarding Zanzibar's Forest and Coastal Habitats for Multiple Benefits
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources (MANR) and First Vice President's Office (FVPO)
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 issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP acknowledges UNDP's proposal "Safeguarding Zanzibar's Forest and Coastal Habitats for Multiple Benefits". The proposal aims to strengthen biodiversity conservation, sustainable land and forest management while contributing to climate change mitigation. Institutional and policy frameworks on biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services are to be strengthened. Zanzibar's participatory planning agreements, Community-Forest Management Agreements (COFMAs), will be strengthened as a vehicle to improve ecosystem services. STAP appreciates the maps of the protected areas in Zanzibar, and welcomes the efforts planned to revise the maps so they are specific to the project site. STAP also is pleased about the details on land use and land cover, forest classification (including area), and woody biomass. This information assists in contextualizing the diversity of forest resources and biodiversity on the island, as well as Zanzibar's potential to produce bioenergy from woody biomass.

To strengthen the project, STAP proposes addressing the following:

1. STAP encourages UNDP to develop further activities on climate change mitigation (e.g. climate smart agriculture), and land management to support the expected project results and targets (page 5). It also encourages stronger links, or integrated planning, between activities on biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, and climate change mitigation, and clearer definitions of the global environmental benefits for the latter two activities.
2. The project proponents should consider how to strengthen the evidence base of applying landscape approaches for achieving synergies between agricultural production, forest management and biodiversity conservation. The following two papers may be useful to consider when designing the project: 1) Sunderland, T., et al. (2017). "A methodological approach for assessing cross-site landscape change: Understanding socio-ecological system". *Forest Policy and Economics* 84 (2017) 83–91; and 2) Reed, J. et al. (2016). "Integrated landscape approaches to managing social and environmental issues in the tropics:

learning from the past to guide the future their progress is measured and to support indicators, so they capture measurements". *Global Change Biology* (2016) 22, 2540–2554, doi: 10.1111/gcb.13284

3. STAP agrees that an approach should be used to address the multiple environmental degradation drivers affecting the project site. The PIF recommends a landscape approach. STAP encourages, however, that the project proponents consider a source-to-sea approach, which will assist in meeting the project's objective on safeguarding Zanzibar's terrestrial and coastal forest habitats for multiple benefits. A source-to-sea framework facilitates integrated planning across sectors (e.g. biodiversity, land management, climate change mitigation), and institutions. The framework also encourages governance, which is an important element for the project's sustainability. The project proponents may want to consider the source-to-sea conceptual framework proposed on page 15 in STAP's report "A Conceptual Framework For Governing and Managing Key Flows in a Source-to-Sea Continuum": <http://www.stapgef.org/conceptual-framework-governing-and-managing-key-flows-source-sea-continuum>

STAP also recommends drawing from the following paper in the project design; this provides an environmental and socio-economic assessment of Zanzibar's needs for integrated coastal management. It also provides recommendations on how to improve Zanzibar's management of natural resources based on Zanzibar's forest management plan, Zanzibar's forest policy, and other initiatives that aim to improve Zanzibar's land and coastal management: Khamis, A., et al. (2017). "Geographical characterization of the Zanzibar coastal zone and its management perspectives". *Ocean & Coastal Management* 149 (2017) 116-134

4. STAP recommends explaining how the intervention will achieve "Support to transformational shifts towards a low emission". The PIF provides an estimate for carbon benefits, but it does not appear to include an activity that addresses climate change mitigation (e.g. climate smart agriculture, sustainable production of bioenergy). It was not possible therefore to determine the scientific and technical soundness of this corporate level result (page 5). During the project design, it would be valuable to establish links, and trade-offs, between sustainable bioenergy production, forest management, and biodiversity conservation.

5. The stakeholder table in the PIF presents an unduly top-down perception of the project, where governmental agencies and NGOs are detailed, but local groups such as different land user groups are apparently dismissed in one or two lines. STAP urges the project proponents to undertake a full stakeholder analysis in the PPG phase. The stakeholder analysis suggested by STAP should drill deeper into the communities and groups, including the role of men and women, actually involved in resource exploitation and who will necessarily be part of the integrated management of Zanzibar's resources. A useful starting point is the World Bank guidance on its anti-corruption pages - <http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/PoliticalEconomy/stakeholderanalysis.htm> . There are also a number of purpose-built tools to conduct stakeholder analysis – see for example, on the europa.eu website a Stakeholder Analysis Tool that has an 'actor assessment matrix' that includes the interests, resources, and power-base of all stakeholders. A social science input here would be very relevant.

6. STAP recommends that the project propose a framework on the use and management of bioenergy that is supported by stakeholders. The purpose will be to implement a regulatory framework for sustainable charcoal production that decreases threats to forest resources, and biodiversity. The framework should be informed by an assessment of charcoal production, including consumption data, if available, technologies used, and a life cycle assessment of charcoal production. This paper, although based on Brazil's experience with charcoal production, may provide insights: Miranda Santos, S., et al. (2017). "Life Cycle Analysis of Charcoal Production in Masonry Kilns with and without Carbonization Process Generated Gas Combustion". *Sustainability* 2017, 9, 1558; doi:10.3390/su9091558 A paper on charcoal production in Tanzania may complement the information and data on charcoal production: Felix, M. et al (2017). "Future prospect and sustainability of wood fuel resources in Tanzania". *RenewableandSustainableEnergyReviews*51(2015)856–862

7. In addition to a robust monitoring and assessment system, STAP recommends strengthening the knowledge management and learning element of the project by adding a fourth component. The project should consider how it will advance learning of COFMAs' impacts on biodiversity conservation, and sustainable land management. COFMAs have an established baseline as a participatory planning process, and can benefit from the project's insights. The project proponents also should design the project in a manner that establishes adaptive learning as part of the monitoring and assessment system, and which facilitates responses to the learning in a structured manner. UNDP can refer to the GEF's website on knowledge management and learning, or STAP's RAPTA guidelines to help guide the development of structured knowledge management and learning: <http://www.thegef.org/topics/knowledge-learning>; <http://www.thegef.org/publications/designing-projects-rapidly-changing-work>

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<p>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:</p> <p>(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.</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>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<p>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:</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</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>