

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10705
Project Title	Strengthening Capacities for Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species (SMIAS) in Indonesia
Date of Screening	November 29, 2020
STAP member screener	Graciela Metternicht
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor</p> <p>STAP acknowledges FAO’s proposal on Strengthening Capacities for Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species (SMIAS) in Indonesia, with a focus on the National Parks in East Java and South Sulawesi. The objective of this project is to safeguard globally significant biodiversity and ecosystem services through improved prevention, control and management of invasive alien species (IAS).</p> <p>Although IAS impacts have not been systematically studied in Indonesia, they pose a significant threat to the country’s biodiversity, ecosystem functions, and socio-economic development. Evidence points to IAS as one of the most important causes of ecosystem degradation across most of the country’s national parks.</p> <p>The PIF identifies multiple pathways of IAS introduction in the country, and barriers the project needs to overcome to realize the positive impacts stated in the Theory of Change. In recognition of the drivers and barriers, and the threats that IAS pose to some of the most important endemic and/or endangered species in the country, the project proposes a multi-scale (national to local) approach to IAS management:</p> <p>At the national level, a key aspect of the project strategy is to establish the first dedicated government unit in Indonesia to oversee the coordination of IAS management throughout the country, which will facilitate cross-sectoral approaches among line ministries and raise awareness of and support for IAS</p>

	<p>management among decision-makers and the general public. At the local/site level, the project plans to adopt a landscape level approach to IAS management, building on lessons from past efforts in Indonesia.</p> <p>STAP welcomes the multi-level approach, and the adoption of a landscape level approach for the design of interventions; and the capitalizing of prior project experiences and learning — from the region and elsewhere.</p> <p>STAP recommends consideration of behavioral insights (cultural norms, traditions, perceptions and values) in designing interventions driven by the assumption that “local-level stakeholders will realize tangible ecological, social and economic benefits from improved IAS management, thereby providing them with incentives to support IAS management post-project changing behaviors.”</p> <p>Furthermore, STAP recommends a broader use of geospatial technologies (GIS, remote sensing) in support of activities related to outputs 1.21, 1.2.2, 1.2.3, all outputs of component 2, and output 3.2.1, and the linking of activities to the country’s existing land administration or land use planning system. In this regard, the scientific conceptual framework for land degradation neutrality (LDN) and STAP LDN guidelines offer good practice guidance on how this could be done in de-centralized land use planning systems as the one of Indonesia.</p> <p>STAP notes that the climate risk of this project is high, and therefore strongly recommends the project considers all the recommendations arising from the Climate Risk Screening during PPG phase.</p>	
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
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, provided a good set of indicators and associated metrics linked to the GEBs are identified in the PPG and made part of project M&E.
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.	Provided in pg. 25 and Annex
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, drivers, pressures and barriers are introduced (pgs. 19-21). The project further describes the criteria used to select the project field activities.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes, barriers and threats are described and there is a good support of 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?	A number of laws and policies constitute the primary instruments governing IAS management in Indonesia.
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes, the project names the laws and policies that constitute the primary instruments governing IAS management in Indonesia; its previous and on-going programs in Indonesia on IAS management and related issues that constitute an important baseline for the proposed project (pgs. 23-24)
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	While the PIF identifies projects and legal instruments relevant to the baseline scenarios, STAP recommends the PPG identify indicators and associated metrics to make possible

		quantification of the project benefits. Such indicators can be multi-scale, and a mix of qualitative and quantitative (e.g. use the SMART principles).
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	yes
	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	Yes, the project describes lessons from past projects and details how these lessons have informed the design of this PIF.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	See above.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	The Theory of Change envisions i) a reduction in the risk of IAS being introduced into and spreading within Indonesia; ii) models, capacities and experience that enable protected area managers and other stakeholders to effectively prevent the introduction and manage the presence of IAS in landscapes that are critically important for biodiversity conservation; and iii) widespread recognition that IAS prevention and management is a national priority with important ecological, social and economic benefits for the people of Indonesia. To achieve these end states, the proposed project includes a suite of interventions organized under three interconnected components: 1) strengthened policy, regulatory, institutional and financing frameworks for IAS management; 2) demonstrated landscape-level approaches to IAS management; and 3) strengthened knowledge & awareness of IAS issues among key stakeholders.

		Key assumptions underpin the expected outcomes, including: enactment of a new umbrella regulation on IAS; creation and sustained support for a Biosecurity Task Force; increased budget allocations for IAS management and/or levies on shipping/air transportation; and support for the up-scaling of IAS management approaches throughout the protected area system in the country. The project design also assumes that local-level stakeholders will realize tangible ecological, social and economic benefits from improved IAS management, thereby providing them with incentives to support IAS management post-project.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	See above. The project links activities with outputs and outcomes.
	What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	It is described in the three project components.
	Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Mechanisms of change are plausible, although STAP suggests the inclusion of behavioral insights (see earlier comments) in the design of certain interventions.
	Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Partly in the section of risks and how the project team plans to tackle those risks. STAP recommends that aspect be further developed in the Theory of Change during the PPG, by including risks as external/internal factors that may affect project outputs/outcomes and identifying adaptive management that may be needed (STAP Theory of Change primer offers guidance in this regard)
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?	It is highly plausible that the proposed incremental activities will deliver the envisioned GEBs. To this end the PPG will need to identify indicators associated with activities, and indicators of baseline (e.g. indicators of ecosystem services that are to be preserved or enhanced and that make up the set of GEBs the project mentions). A good system for tracking

		progress of activities, outputs and adaptive management is required as well.
	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) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits, and are they measurable?	The GEBs mentioned are global and related to the 3 Rio Conventions. STAP recommends including the 3 LDN core indicators a part of the set of indicators that will enable to measure the GEBs.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	The risk section mentions inefficient funding to continue necessary IAS management after the project ends as a moderate risk, hence the PPG should revise if all of the projected benefits are to be attained in the project lifetime, and identify activities that generate benefits that may require timeframes longer than the project lifecycle to be realized (and correct the claimed benefits accordingly). For instance, evidence of benefits of land restoration from conservation agriculture may take longer than the project lifecycle.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes, they are defined though more work is needed to make them 'measurable'.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	To a certain extent. Methods are explained, but frameworks to identify indicators and metrics need to be developed in the PPG.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	This is not clear and the climate risk screening points to that deficiency and how to overcome that. STAP suggests that interventions related to conservation agriculture be climate-resilient, and that interventions consider the climate change projections. Recent research from south Africa points to the impacts of climate change in the future spread of <i>Salvinia molesta</i> one of the IAS that this project focuses on.
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?	There is innovation in: a) the fact that the project will establish Indonesia's first dedicated government unit

		<p>for the management of invasive alien species;</p> <p>b) The piloting of a landscape level approach to IAS management that addresses IAS threats across both productive agricultural and forest lands as well as adjacent protected areas,</p> <p>c) project activities will develop the use of effective, safe and cost-efficient Biological Control Agents (BCAs) for IAS management (innovation in Indonesia)</p> <p>More innovation can be included in this project through:</p> <p>a) incorporation of behavioral insights in the design of activities (see forthcoming STAP guidance on behavioral change);</p> <p>b) more use of GIS and remote sensing in selected components (see earlier comments)</p> <p>c) the linking of activities with the land use planning system of the country (see LDN guidelines)</p>
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes, sections of sustainability and scaling up include a clear vision.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Successful delivery of the outcomes requires a mix of incremental and transformational change. For example, success of component 1 requires activities that are more transformative than incremental.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Provided.
2. Stakeholders.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes, pg. 38 has a Table that lists the main stakeholders and stakeholder groups, introduces

<p>Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities.</p> <p>If none of the above, please explain why.</p> <p>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>their relevant mandate and how they may be involved in the project preparation. A detailed stakeholder involvement and participation plan will be prepared during the project development phase</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>See above.</p>
<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</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>STAP is pleased that the PIF identifies the role of women in the intervention landscapes, including those from the indigenous Tengger communities.</p> <p>During project preparation, a full gender analysis and gender disaggregated assessment will be undertaken to determine: the differentiated impacts of IAS on women; the different knowledge base of men and women; strategies for mainstreaming gender into IAS management; and strategies for optimizing the opportunities for women to participate in and benefit from IAS management activities during the project and more generally.</p> <p>STAP advises the use of the Manual for Gender-Responsive Land Degradation Neutrality Transformative Projects and</p>

<p>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</p>		<p>Programmes, and relevant GEF and FAO gender guidelines</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>No, however STAP recommends that interventions tackling training, awareness raising, and job opportunities do include youth. Indonesia's population of youth is projected to increase to 70 million by 2035, and with less experience and fewer on-the-job skills than adults, school-leavers can often encounter difficulties in competing in the job market, especially for more desirable well-paying job. This project can help to create green job opportunities for youth, while training and educating these future leaders.</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, 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? 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 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? 	<p>Yes, the risk identified are valid. While climate change risks are identified, STAP recommends the team develops the PPG with the question here on the left in their mind, and the inclusion of the recommendation from the climate risk screening.</p>

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
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	yes
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	yes
	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, see section 8. And STAP further recommends reaching out to global knowledge hubs like the one of the UNCCD.
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?	<p>Component #3 and Section 8 describe the KM approach of the project. Noteworthy is that under Component 3, awareness initiatives will be implemented to increase the general public's awareness and understanding of IAS issues and impacts, including documenting, using and disseminating local / traditional knowledge and wisdom regarding IAS impacts and IAS management options.</p> <p>STAP recommends the PPG focus on developing indicators and metrics to assess effectiveness and impact of the proposed approach to KM and sharing.</p>
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Pg. 34 and section 8 deal with these aspects of the project.

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>