

## STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
<b>GEF ID</b>	10679
<b>Project Title</b>	Management of Indonesian and Timor-Leste Transboundary Watersheds (MITLTW)
<b>Date of Screening</b>	23 November 2020
<b>STAP member screener</b>	Blake Ratner
<b>STAP secretariat screener</b>	Virginia Gorsevski
<b>STAP Overall Assessment and Rating</b>	<p><b>Minor</b></p> <p>STAP welcomes this project from Conservation International on the management of Indonesian and Timor-Leste transboundary watersheds.</p> <p>The project design follows the typical TDA-SAP logic, aiming to build a durable transboundary management entity to drive GEBs in the shared basins. While the theory of change is presented, it is missing explicit assumptions; these should be developed and integrated prior to CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Particular attention will need to be paid to developing project implementation approaches that respect and implement in practice commitments regarding indigenous peoples. The description of private sector roles remains vague, with reference to land use, supply chains, and income generation opportunities. These factors suggest the need for particular scrutiny of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan to be developed during PPG stage.</p> <p>Plausible risks are indicated, but these do not appear complete. There is no identified risk regarding potential conflict among various community-level and private sector stakeholders stemming from competing objectives / interests in resource use.</p> <p>Thinking beyond the project implementation period, there should also be consideration of risks related to inadequate</p>

	institutionalization of transboundary arrangements and durable incentives for improved resource use practices. What measures will help ensure that a well-written and agreed SAP does not languish like prior agreements?	
<b>Part I: Project Information</b> <b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b>	<b>What STAP looks for</b>	<b>Response</b>
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes.
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 adaptation benefits?	Yes.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, in addition to management of transboundary freshwater resources, the project has downstream implications in areas of exceptional marine biodiversity.
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, clearly structured.
<b>Part II: Project justification</b>	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
<b>1. Project description.</b> <b>Briefly describe:</b> 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.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Barriers are briefly described, without substantiating data and references.
	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?	Adequate.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Adequate, given relatively little background data apparently available.
	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?	Theory of change provided, including useful mapping of components to barriers addressed, and subsequent "barriers changed" descriptions.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Follows typical TDA-SAP logic, aiming to build a durable transboundary management entity to drive GEBs in the shared basins. This is apparently well beyond the current expectations of the Joint Forestry Working Group designated under existing binational agreement, so care will be needed to establish / adapt the necessary institutional framework.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	Clearly presented.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes. Explicit assumptions are missing; these should be developed and integrated prior to CEO endorsement.

	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	M&E systems (component 4) designed to enable adaptive management.
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?	Benefits are plausible, though mechanisms to influence ground-level action will need further development.
	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/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes, in line with IW objectives.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Indicators are preliminary; methodologies require further elaboration.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Includes aspects related to identifying and building awareness around climate change risks, and promoting climate-smart agricultural and water-use practices.
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?	
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes, within other basins shared by the two countries. Expectation of lessons being made available to other SIDS as well.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	For enduring transboundary collaboration, transformation is required. Current basis of agreements and institutions for cooperation appear very preliminary and untested.

<p><b>1b. Project Map and Coordinates.</b> Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.</p>		<p>Map provided, geo coordinates missing.</p>
<p><b>2. Stakeholders.</b> 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.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Local consultations are reasonably deferred to PPG stage, citing political sensitivities.</p> <p>Particular attention will need to be paid to developing project implementation approaches that respect and implement in practice commitments regarding indigenous peoples. The PIF notes: “Proper involvement of civil society and indigenous peoples is increasingly important in both Indonesia and Timor-Leste, in accordance with national laws specifically reflecting their rights and access to resources. . . However, in both countries implementation of such principles and regulations continues to lag.”</p> <p>Description of private sector roles remains vague, with reference to land use, supply chains, and income generation opportunities.</p> <p>These factors suggest the need for particular scrutiny of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan to be developed during PPG stage.</p>
	<p>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>	<p>Approach outlined is adequate with regard to government bodies, very preliminary regarding other stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>3. Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment.</b> 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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Description of gender considerations is minimal but includes appropriate measures to be considered during development of Gender Mainstreaming Plan.</p>

<p>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>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	<p>Needs further elaboration.</p>
<p><b>5. Risks.</b> 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</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"> <li>• 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?</li> <li>• Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</li> <li>• Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</li> </ul>	<p>Plausible risks are indicated, but these do not appear complete. In the risk table, there is no indication of risks related to technical capacity of implementers (though reference is made to potential competing priorities, and later in the narrative, to capacity of supporting institutions). Likewise, there is no identified risk regarding potential conflict among various community-level and private sector stakeholders stemming from competing objectives / interests in resource use.</p> <p>Thinking beyond the project implementation period, there should also be consideration of risks related to inadequate institutionalization of transboundary arrangements and durable incentives</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</li> </ul>	for improved resource use practices. What measures will help ensure that a well-written and agreed SAP does not languish like prior agreements? The positive text on enabling environment seems to gloss over this question.
<b>6. Coordination.</b> 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?	Relevant plans for coordination indicated with a relatively small number of related projects.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Apparently yes, given the small number.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Plans appear to incorporate lessons regarding livelihood options, environmental trends, institutional setup.
	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.
<b>8. Knowledge management.</b> 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?	Plans describe appear appropriate. Good indication of intent to draw upon university expertise in the region to support learning processes.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Role of tri-national university consortium suggests potential for durable support to capacity and knowledge exchange beyond the project implementation period.

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
1. <b>Concur</b>	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 <b><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></b>
2. <b>Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	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><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></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>