Part I: Project Information		Responsoe
GEF ID	10404	
Project Title	**Inclusive conservation initiative**	
Date of Screening	**5-Dec-19**	
STAP member Screener	Rosie Cooney	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment		**Minor issues to be considered during project design:** STAP is very supportive of this project, excited to see funding directed directly to IPLCs, and views this project as having high potential for large-scale transformative impact. However, we have certain concerns, particularly regarding the exclusion at this early stage of large geographic areas that appear to meet the specified criteria, notably the whole of southern Africa, without any apparent consultation with IPLC groups from that region. The rationale for this is not made clear in the proposal. Further, there is a lack of clear definition of "local communities" and no discussion of how traditional communities not generally considered indigenous, such as those in much of rural Africa, will be incorporated. An inevitable and significant challenge for this project will be ensuring very clear and transparent processes for allocation of funding, in order to avoid generating conflicts between IPLC organisations and concerns around perceived bias, conflict of interest, or favoritism. Overall, however, the proposal is exceptionally well-written and well-planned, innovative, embeds durability principles, and in our view has a very high chance of transformative success.
Part I: Project Information		
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes, particularly clear and direct.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes.
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Yes.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
1. Project description. Briefly describe:		
1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes, particularly clear, well-articulated and well-referenced.

	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Very clear. It is questionable whether unsustainable development pressures is really a root cause, rather than a proximate driver resulting from deeper root causes (particular economic models and ideologies, power relations, population expansion etc). In barriers, it could also be usefully pointed out the cognitive barriers to change, including particular prevailing assumptions and paradigms around conservation e.g. it is best done by governments, it requires excluding people from landscapes, etc. In practice these are major barriers often difficult to overcome. Greater participation is an effective intervention to address these.
	For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?	
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	The baseline focuses on identifying relevant work of other organisations/initiatives rather than establishing a baseline in terms of the indicators. However, given that this project will determine target geographies in its next phase, a more detailed baseline would not be possible. The gaps that remain, taking into account all these initiatives, is clearly specified.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	
	For multiple focal area projects:	
	are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	

	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	STAP remains concerned, as previously highlighted, that candidate geographies have already been designated, and particularly that large areas with extensive areas of community-managed lands have already been excluded. It is notable that in Africa, the entirety of East Africa (falling into the drylands) and the entire Congo Basin is included - and yet the entirety of southern Africa is excluded. Why? Southern Africa has many areas of high biodiversity values and its role in establishing extensive community management is well known and documented, yet it appears it has been entirely excluded from consideration at this stage. Was IPLC consultation in this region carried out, and to what extent, as the basis of this exclusion? As in previous iterations, the only map of IPLC territories referred to (although not included) indicates only indigenous territories, not those managed by local communities (from Garnett et al).
	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	In Outcome 3.1, and in text on Output 3.1.1, STAP recommends including specific reference to other key non-Rio conservation conventions, particularly those where IPLCs are actively seeking to engage or that are currently considering how to better engage IPLCs, namely CITES and CMS.
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes, very strong.
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Yes.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes. The project requests expanded resources for the PPG phase - this appears justified given the extensive consultations required by the nature of the project.
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	Yes.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Yes.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	Yes, highly innovative.

	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes. Note in Table 7: there have been numerous calls in CITES also for greater participation by IPLCs.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	This project seeks to bring about transformational change.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Note map 1 is biodiversity hotspots, not high biodiversity areas - hotspots reflect both biodiversity and level of threat.
2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities.If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	This is a very comprehensive list. But how will consultations with IPLCs be carried out where there is no regional representative IPLC group? Also, how will local communities that are not represented in indigenous peoples' networks be integrated into consultations?
	What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?	This is clearly mapped out.
3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Yes, this is clearly and well thought-through.
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	
5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?	The measures to address any perceived favoritism or lack of transparency are very important - this could cause a great deal of conflict between IPLCs. See points above re exclusion of southern Africa from the initiative and criteria for selection of the EAs.
	Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?	
	For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:	

	· How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?	
	· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?	
	· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?	
	· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?	
6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives	Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?	Learnings from other projects are not explicitly identified. However, the proposal is well referenced and draws on learnings from research and literature.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	
	Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?	
8. Knowledge management. Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	This is sound.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	
STAP advisory response	**Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed**	
1. Concur	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. 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.	
	* In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that ***"STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design."***	

2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	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:	
	(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.	
	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.	
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	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:	
	(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. 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.	