

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10731
Project Title	Strengthened Systems for Community-based Conservation of Forests and Peatland Landscapes in Indonesia (CoPLI)
Date of Screening	18 May 18, 2021
STAP member screener	John Donaldson
STAP secretariat screener	Alessandro Moscuza
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor issues to be considered during project design.</p> <p>This project is proposing to implement activities to protect and sustainably manage some forests and peatland ecosystems, which are rich in biodiversity and contain many endemic, rare and endangered species, as well as providing ecosystem services such as watershed control, food production, genetic resources and carbon sequestration that are of critical importance both at the regional and global level. In doing so it would address a need that has been identified in several assessments of conservation needs in the area. STAP review concluded that this was an interesting proposal, focusing on strengthening institutional and financial frameworks and working with communities to improve management and conservation of peatlands. The project is based on sound premises and covered most aspects adequately well. The project objective was well defined as were the problems that will be addressed and the benefits that will accrue from implementing project activities. Other areas such as risk, stakeholder engagement and innovation were also well-articulated. The proposal also included a number of detailed annexes covering important areas such as climate risk screening and profiling, lessons learning and a description of proposed protected areas for selection as project landscapes, which provided additional strength to overall proposal. However, other aspects of the proposal were found to be lacking in clarity, sufficient detail and in some cases even coherence. Among these should be highlighted the components, outcomes and outputs structure, which was found to be in need of substantial revisions, as well as the theory of change, which was found to be lacking in a number of areas. In addition, recent academic syntheses of peatland restoration and conservation (e.g. Harrison et al 2019, Hergoualc'h et al 2017) have noted the lack of agreed standards for measuring the impact of interventions; the difficulty of identifying suitable targets due to the multiple possible outcomes (e.g. wetting, fire prevention,</p>

	sustainable livelihoods); and the complexity of on the ground work with communities due to multiple stakeholders and competing interests. The PPG should spell out how these challenges will be addressed. Further details on all of these aspects, including STAP advice on suggested remedial actions, are provided in the relevant sections of this document.	
Part I: Project Information B. Indicative Project Description Summary	What STAP looks for	Response
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes, the projective was clearly stated and was well-aligned with the issues identified in the problems section of the PIF.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	The main elements that would be expected of a project of this nature and scope were included in the project components. Component 2 and 3 were phrased reasonably well and were congruent with the overall structure of the project. Component 1 included three fundamental elements of the project (i.e. institutional framework, development of multi-stakeholder partnerships and sustainable financing), but in our view, these were not assembled in a coherent logical fashion that would support a strong theory of change or causal pathway to impact. The institutional framework element should have probably been kept in a separate component from the rest and the link between creating a partnership framework and sustainable financing should have been better explained. STAP advises the implementing agency to review this section of the PIF.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Outcome 3 was well constructed and was well-integrated into the logical flow from project component to output. Outcome 1 was constructed from two completely disjointed elements (i.e. <i>an improved policy and regulatory framework</i> , which was inappropriately combined with a <i>‘financial framework’</i> , and <i>an increase in financing for conservation and community development generated through new financial instruments</i>). Even though these elements are obviously related (and somewhat dependent) to one another, they are not one and the same, and should not be merged into one outcome without a specific explanation of how this

	Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	would be done and why. STAP strongly advises the implementing agency to review this section of the PIF with the help of a logframe or M&E specialist to improve its coherence and logical flow. benefits.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	If the activities described in part II of the PIF are implemented as indicated, then the GEBs listed in the project proposal are likely to be achieved. However, this is not evident from reading part I of the PIF, which we suggest should be revised as indicated above. In addition, the project should specify how the GEBs are going to be measured. The outputs refer to ha's of rehabilitated land or land under improved management and these could refer to a variety of possible states depending on what factors are emphasized.
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?	The outputs related to outcome 3 (i.e. outputs 3.1 and 3.2) are of an adequate standard and show a clear pathway to impact upward to the outcome level. On the other hand, output 1 & 2 present a number of incongruencies and are also disjointed in places, furthermore some outputs should be upgraded as outcomes and vice versa. <u>For example: output 1.1.</u> should be an outcome not an output; output 1.2. while adequate by itself, is disjointed from the relevant project outcome and component; output 1.3 would fit well as an output under output 1.1, if this was 'upgraded' to be an outcome, but at present is disjointed from the logical flow of outcome and component 1 in its current state. STAP strongly advises the implementing agency to review this section of the PIF with the help of a logframe or M&E specialist to improve its coherence and logical flow.
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	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes, the PIF includes a dedicated section, which describes the environmental and climate change issues faced by Indonesia as a country clearly and to a good degree of depth. All the information provided is adequately referenced and in a number of cases (e.g. Indonesia country climate profile) is supported by

need to be addressed (systems description)		additional info in separate annex documents, which was also reviewed and deemed to be very adequate.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, the PIF included a section on the barriers to achieving project objectives. These include a comprehensive range of factors, which were substantiated by a reasonable amount of data, although no references. Recent syntheses dealing with Indonesia's peatlands (Hergoualc'h et al 2017 and Harrison et al 2019) identify many of the same barriers and can provide appropriate references. Our analysis of the facts and data provided concluded that these were consistent with the accepted consensus. STAP's only suggestion for this section would be that some references are added to substantiate the data and facts already provided.
	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?	N/A
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes, the PIF includes a dedicated section that identifies and describes a range of pre-existing interventions and initiatives by the govt. of Indonesia. The same identified a number of actions and pathways that will need to be implemented/followed in order to achieve transformational change on the ground.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes, there is a specific sub-section in the baseline scenario assessment, which quantifies the monetary value and expected impacts (e.g. number of beneficiaries) of some other major and closely relevant interventions. This is complemented by a further explanation describing how the current project will complement the activities that will be undertaken, and the results expected through other interventions such as the TEKAD Project in East Indonesia.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes the baseline activities described in the relevant PIF sections appear to be sufficiently grounded, established and well-funded to support the additional cost of this investment.
	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;	N/A

	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	N/A
	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?	The core proposition of the Theory of Change for this Project holds that by putting in place systems for integrating biodiversity in peatland and forest policy, regulatory and financial frameworks, conservation of globally significant threatened species and enhancement of rural community livelihoods will be achieved. Currently, agricultural-driven forest and peatland ecosystems degradation and habitat fragmentation, resulting in significant biodiversity loss in forest and peatland landscapes, are the consequences of a set of barriers that result in management deficiencies.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	-
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	-
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	The ToC presented a logical pathway for transformational change to be achieved through the project activities. Our analysis deemed this to be broadly plausible but highlighted also a number of weaknesses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the causal pathway to impact (which should normally connect proposed project activities to outputs, outcomes and ultimately the project objective) presented a number of gaps and inconsistencies. For example we struggled to see the connection between Output 1.1. (Strengthened peatland conservation institutional capacity, processes and mainstreamed biodiversity conservation) and what was apparently listed as a sub-output (<i>At least 5 new/updated guidelines or sub-regulations developed and applied to integrate biodiversity outcomes in specific peatland regulatory frameworks</i>). ▪ We found the same for output 1.2 (Assessment and monitoring of peatland landscapes in targeted provinces and identification of priority landscapes for conservation) and its sub-output (<i>162,000 hectares of peatland rehabilitated following mapping, planning and implementation of natural revegetation and use of native species and 200,000</i>

		<p><i>hectares of new peatland areas to be conserved identified), Output 2.2 and to a lesser extent output 2.1.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There were no assumptions or potential risks built anywhere in the ToC flow. ▪ We could not find a ToC diagram or any other form of illustration, which would have helped greatly in visualizing the intended impact pathway(s). ▪ Under Outcome 2, the assumption is that sustainable livelihood models can be developed, implemented across 800 000ha in the project area and upscaled to 500 000 ha outside the main project area. Elsewhere in the document it is stated that alternative livelihoods are constrained by poorly developed markets for NTFP and lack of infrastructure for alternatives (e.g. mills). This raises the question about whether all the outputs are plausible within the project timeframe. The project should specify whether these constraints apply to Outcome 2 and how they will be addressed in order to meet the proposed targets. <p>STAP would strongly advise that the implementing agency reviews this section of the PIF with the help of a M&E specialist and that it revisits the ToC to improve the logical flow and consistency of the impact framework. We would also be happy to discuss this further if needed.</p>
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	These can be easily inferred from reading the ToC section of the PIF document but are not stated explicitly
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?	If all activities are implemented as stated and there are no adverse factors (which should have been stated in the assumptions) it is likely that the environmental benefits stated in the PIF document will be realized.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	N/A
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes, the PIF makes a very solid case why the peatland and forest ecosystems in Indonesia are of global significance; the same applies for the Gunung Palung

and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)		National Park (GPNP) and the Danau Sentarum National Park (DSNP). The proposal includes a description of the global significance of some of the wildlife species that will be targeted [e.g. Orangutan (<i>Pongo pygmaeus sp.</i>), proboscis monkeys (<i>Nasalis larvatus</i>), and sun bear (<i>Helarctos malayanus</i>)].
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes, see above comments.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes the proposal includes a section which described the GEBs that would be achieved from implementing the proposed activities. These are described in a general sense (e.g. conserving globally significant forests) and more specific metrics will need to be identified during the next phase. The same included a sub-section on adaptation benefits such as: resilient food systems and contribution to development objectives. It also includes some mitigation co-benefits, which have been estimated to be ~2,902,000 tCO ₂ of carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	The proposal includes a table that compares three sets of indicators that the project will contribute to but did not appear to include a M&E plan or methodology explaining how the GEBs or adaptation benefits will be measured. This is an important issue given the apparent lack of standards for measuring impacts in peatlands and for possible conflicting targets. STAP advises that the project implementing agency should aim to develop a more detailed M&E plan including a suit of specific indicators, which should be informed by the ToC.
	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?	The PIF included a section on innovation and potential for scaling up, which provided a convincing description of how innovation can be pursued across a range of operational areas such as designing multifunctional agroecosystems and using the peatland hydrological unit (PHU) as the key unit for planning and management. Other aspects that were presented as innovative (e.g. multi-stakeholder partnerships and community driven approaches) have been in use for quite some time. Nevertheless, their innovation may be related to the ecological and social complexity of these landscapes, the need to manage trade-offs affecting different livelihoods,

		and the failures of other attempts to reach consensus between multiple stakeholders.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	One of the outputs is for community-based livelihood models to be scaled up across 500 000 ha in other provinces and then for further upscaling via the TEKAD project.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	-
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		-
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?	Yes, stakeholder engagement is mentioned numerous times throughout the entire length of the PIF and is certainly a central element of the approach proposed by the project proponent. The PIF includes also a specific section where key stakeholder groups are identified and listed by categories in a table. The total number of stakeholder is quite large and impressive, the list of categories is also very comprehensive and comprises: Central Government Agencies, Provincial and District Agencies, Local Government Agencies, Civil Society/NGOs/International Agencies, Research Institutions, Private sector and Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities. This is definitely one of strongest aspects of this project proposal as a whole.
	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?	-

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Will the project’s results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no/tbd</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Yes, the PIF included a short section on gender, which identified some basic gender-related issues for a project of this type. The PIF also stated that Gender analyses, a Gender Action Plan and a gender-responsive results framework will be prepared at a later stage.</p>
	<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible,</p>	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project’s control? Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p> <p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the project’s objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 	<p>The PIF for this project included a risk section, which identified and scored a number of risk categories, as well as proposing mitigation action for each category. Our review concluded that the risk categories identified were adequate for a project of this kind and comprised a reasonably wide range of topics, however we suggest that the COVID 19 risk category should be upgraded to “medium” at least in the short term until national and</p>

propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	<p>2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? 	global vaccination efforts are scaled-up to the required level needed to ensure higher mobility and travel across the region and the risk of potential new variants emerging as a result of continuing high rates of transmission has been reduced to a less significant level.
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?	Yes, the PIF identified and provided a description of a number of other on-going activities in the project area. It also outlined how it intends to collaborate with some of the more relevant one such as the TEKAD project.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes, the PIF has a full Annex section dedicated to this issue, which focuses on describing lessons-learned and the main findings from previous projects implemented under GEF4, GEF5, GEF6, as well as other related IFAD grants.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes, please see above comment.
	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?	Yes, please see above comment.
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?	The PIF has a short section on this topic, which covers the main aspects of KM and describes the approach that will be taken, including the tools that will be used and the products that will be developed.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	-

Notes

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 <i>“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.”</i>
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.

<p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p>	<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. 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>