

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response	
GEF ID	10913	
Project Title	Protection of biodiversity and sustainable land-use in conservation landscapes in South Sulawesi, Gorontalo and East Nusa Tenggara	
Date of Screening	24 May 2022	
STAP member screener	John Donaldson	
STAP secretariat screener	Alessandro Moscuza	
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	Minor issues to be considered during project design. This is a clearly written and well-presented proposal focusing on an area with exceptional biodiversity. The proposal covered all the fundamental elements required at this stage of project development. Our assessment found a number of minor issues that should be adjusted in the next phase of project development (see recommendations) and identified a couple of areas of project design that could be improved (e.g. innovation), but otherwise we found this proposal to be consistent with the expected standards.	
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 project objective is well-defined and is also highly consistent with the description of the issues affecting the target region that was provided in the proposal.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes, the project components support the planned activities, but we noted that the project has only a total of three components. Even though these were well-structured and comprised key elements such technical assistance, implementation of restoration activities and financing, our assessment found that some key activities such as M&E could and probably should have been given more prominence by having a dedicated project component.

Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	The proposal comprises a total of five outcomes, which include important Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs).
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, our assessment concluded that the GEBs listed in the proposal are likely to be generated as described.
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, our review concluded that the sum of the outputs if successfully completed will lead to achievements of the outcomes in all cases.
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, the problem statement was well-articulated and clearly defined. The underlying issues were also described in a very good level of detailed and supported by an adequate amount of technical data and evidence, which was also well-researched and referenced.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	The barriers are all well described, barriers 1 and 3 <u>are</u> also well-referenced but barrier 2 less so and barrier 4 not at all. STAP recommends that this section is revised to include references or data to substantiate the barriers as needed.
	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?	The project aims to tackle three focal areas: biodiversity, land degradation and climate change. The problem statement identifies the drivers of environmental degradation that need to be addresses, but the description of how climate change issues will be addressed or mitigated is tenuous throughout except for the section on core indicators, which provides an explanation of the climate benefits that will be achieve and how.
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	The project proposal provides a lit of interventions and initiatives that have been or are currently being implemented by the Government of Indonesia or the

		Governor of the province of South Sulawesi. Some of these are described in more in dept than others but otherwise they all provide sufficiently detailed information.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Yes, the information provided in the baseline provides sufficient information to inform a quantitative assessment of the project's benefits quantitatively. An analysis of the existing baseline was also used to inform the selection process of target locations, which include areas and villages that were neglected by previous interventions.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Yes, the activities and initiatives described in this project proposal will be incremental to what has been done before and will add value to the existing baseline. The proposal also describes how the project builds on the existing programs undertaken by the Government of Indonesia for biodiversity conservation, maintaining ecosystem services, sustainable land and forest management, and reversing land degradation and presents an alternative scenario that does not include the contribution from the GEF 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;	The multiple baselines are supported by enough data, although not so much references. Also, the multiple baseline analyses appear to cover only two of the three focal areas that we identified, namely biodiversity and land degradation.
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Yes, the project identified a number of other initiatives that provide useful lessons for it to learn from and build upon in order to improve performance and results.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	The project proposal identified a number of ways in which it will learn from other projects and build on their experience to improve results. For example, it indicated how it will draw upon lessons learned from the Forest Programme II (REDD+), which was implemented with funding from the German Development Bank (KFW), and the USAID

		LESTARI project, which also demonstrated effectiveness in mainstreaming recommendations and Low Emission Development Strategies (LEDS) into Provincial and District Spatial Plans (RTRW), Provincial Development Plans (RPJM) and Agency Strategic Plans (Renstra).
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 provides a logical framework for the project by identifying barriers and envisaging three pathways to overcome these barriers. The pathways form the basis for components of the project.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	The sequence of events in the Theory of Change (ToC) is clear, linear and robust at the same time. It is also built upon clear principles and three parallel but converging pathways towards impact, which were remarkably well articulated.
	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?	Yes, the mechanisms of change described in the ToC are very plausible and as already outlined remarkably well articulated. The lower section of the ToC diagram is a bit simplistic as it proposes one solution for a whole raft of issues but does not compromise the overall logical flow or validity of the ToC.
	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 inferred from reading between the lines of the ToC elements but were not recognized explicitly in the ToC narrative.
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, the activities proposed as part of the project proposal if correctly implemented are likely to lead to the realization of the environmental benefits stated, which include a total area of 514,848 hectares to be improved and protected through a mix rehabilitation, restoration and sustainable land-use. This area comprises: 20,135 ha of conservation forest; 202,322 ha of protected forest, and 62,297 ha of production forest.
	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?	The environmental benefits listed are measurable and have an element of global significance because of the number of endemic and endangered species contained in the target area, as well as the carbon sequestration benefits, which include a total of 9,931,819 tCO ₂ equivalent.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	The project proposed an investment of US\$ 7,471,233 plus an additional 38,928,943 in co-financing. The scale of projected benefits and results is compelling in relation to the proposed 'direct' investment and is adequate in relation to the sum of this and the additional co-financing.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes, they are. See above comments for their significance in global terms.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Yes, the proposal presents a clear set of indicators and explains how these will be applied to measure the results and environmental benefits that the project aims to deliver.
	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 project's proposed approach on innovation is based on the solid foundation of: aiming to develop innovative solutions to persistent problems in land management which has resulted in biodiversity loss and land degradation. However, the actual activities proposed to implement this are not highly innovative and we could not find any substantial innovative approaches covering any of the main categories (e.g. design, financing, technology etc.) Nevertheless, there are some elements of the project's approach that present the potential to deliver a degree of innovation, for example the proposed creation of community-based business ventures (BUMDes), which builds local accountability may enable the creation of hybrid financing and business model down the line, which would be quite 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, the project proposal presented a reasonable plan for scaling-up planned activities, which was clearly articulated. The main challenge in this

		respect will be to ensure that there are substantial innovations to be scaled-up in the first place.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Given the nature of this intervention and the type of activities proposed, we expect that incremental adaptation will be required to achieve long term sustainability. The project aims to achieve this by embedding the Integrated Conservation Landscape Plans (ICLPs) outcomes into Medium-Term Development Plans, District Level Plans, Social Forestry Plans in 35-year concessions, and FMU plans, operations and investments.
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, the project proposal includes a dedicated section to this topic, which lists a range of stakeholders from different sectors including government, business, academia and civil society. Our assessment was that this list covered more than adequately the full spectrum of program activities, challenges and barriers.
	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. 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 proposal provides a good description of how gender issues may affect the implementation of the project. It also describes how participation of women in conservation activities will be promoted, in line with the social and cultural expectations relevant to the socio-economic realities of Indonesia and more specifically South Sulawesi.</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, rather it is expected that the project will enable participating women to develop an empowerment engagement strategy and associated activities related to social forestry and enterprise development at the village and community level.</p>
<p>5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project</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>	<p>The proposal includes a very good risk section that identified a comprehensive set of potential risks, which were offset by well-reasoned mitigation actions. These included a number of climate risks and sensitivities as well as technical and institutional</p>

objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	<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? 	capacity. The risk section also has a dedicated subsection on Climate Change and Disaster Risks, as well as potential CC risks to the project. The proposal also indicates clearly that a more detailed climate risk analysis and assessment will be undertaken during the next stage of project development (i.e. PPG phase). The only minor aspect we thought could be improved was the risk scoring, which was done using a single category (i.e. risk level). Even though this is acceptable STAP would recommend that the risk scoring be split into two categories: "likelihood and impact"
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 project will be executed at the national level by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK) and will also follow UNEP's standard monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures. The project will also ensure coordination with other GEF projects and initiatives through KLHK, UNEP, Yayasan Bambu Lestari and Burung Indonesia, two NGOs that are engaged in related initiatives in Indonesia. Activities in this area will include coordination and sharing of lessons learned with other national and sub-national initiatives and GEF-funded projects, such as the UNDP funded Enhancing the Protected Area System in Sulawesi for Biodiversity Conservation (E-PASS) that aims to effectively managed system of protected areas in Sulawesi.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes, please see above comments.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes, these include lessons from the Forest Programme II (REDD+), USAID LESTARI project and the FAO Strengthening Forest Management Unit for Sustainable Forest Management among others.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	We were not able to determine whether any lessons learned from previous and/or ongoing projects were used to inform the project's formulation, but we could see that the current project was designed to complement and build on existing initiative.

Commented [SL1]: Does the proposal include climate risk screening? If not, we should recommend that they do it given that Indonesia is highly vulnerable to climate change impacts.
<https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/country/indonesia>

Commented [AM2R1]: Sunday yes it does, and it is fine. I thought the narrative we used implied that, but I have added some text to emphasize this.

	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?	We could find no reference to a specific mechanism that would be designed specifically for this purpose.
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 project proposal made clear references to a knowledge management plan for the project that would ensure the development of proof of concept and the policy/legal basis for replication and scaling to other landscapes in Indonesia, as well as the passage of technical instructions and guidelines on how to activate regulatory decrees.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	The project aims to develop M&E systems that are linked or aligned to those of other Provincial governments and the Government of Indonesia to ensure the project is generating lessons, knowledge and results that can be replicated a different scale within the geographical context of Indonesia.

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.

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. 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>