

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10728
Project Title	Investing in the Komodo Dragon and other globally threatened species in Flores (IN-FLORES)
Date of Screening	November 22 2020
STAP member screener	Rosie Cooney
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor</p> <p>STAP welcomes this project from UNDP to invest in the Komodo Dragon and other globally threatened species in Flores.</p> <p>This appears to be a potentially exciting project with innovative biodiversity financing elements and an integrated approach across the landscape and economic sectors. It aims to establish sound integrated management of the Komodo dragon, other threatened species, and their habitats through establishing new governance mechanisms, and mainstreaming biodiversity into economic sectors and livelihood activities, with the help of supportive financing instruments.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the PIF itself is not particularly well-written. There is a lot of repetition and overlap of content between sections - it would be much easier for the reader if the PIF said each thing only once and only under the relevant heading, and in some areas much detail has been left to PPG phase.</p> <p>The theory of change (TOC) is a good start, with some strong elements, but needs further work to be a genuine useful TOC and go beyond essentially a graphically displayed logframe. Additional outputs are required in order for them to add up to achieving the desired outcomes. The relationship of the intervention to previous/other initiatives could be made clearer.</p> <p>The complexities and uncertainty around enabling and empowering local people and businesses to choose conservation-friendly but economically feasible livelihood/enterprise options</p>

	could benefit from further examination, particularly from a rights and governance perspective. These options need to be freely chosen and support local aspirations if they are going to be effective and widely taken up.	
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 objective of this project is "To promote conservation of Komodo dragon and other globally threatened species in Flores through strengthened and integrated management of multiple use landscapes and seascapes". This is clear and does relate clearly to the problem.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes. The activities do appear well targeted to achieving the objectives.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	These are reasonably clearly articulated.
	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?	No - while the outputs are all necessary, they are not sufficient to achieve the outcomes. There are other key outputs that are necessary (or these need to be modified). For instance, to achieve outcome 1, guidelines and planning frameworks must be not just produced but consistently applied in practice, with adequate enforcement/compliance measures; likewise, ecosystem managements frameworks must be not just developed but widely understood, supported and implemented in practice.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
1. Project description. Briefly describe:	Is the problem statement well-defined?	No, it is not particularly well-defined. The text refers to illegal killing, habitat degradation, pollution, expanding settlements, infrastructure

<p>1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)</p>		<p>development, unsustainable forestry and wood collection (as well as unsustainable fishing practices), but the dynamics, relative importance and extent of these threats, plus their drivers, are all unclear.</p> <p>There is very little data or analysis presented on socio-economic aspects of the problem. The project focuses on Komodo dragon but figures indicating a decline (or other evidence to describe it) are not provided. There is only very scant detail on the extent of other threats too.</p>
	<p>Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?</p>	<p>The barriers are articulated as lack of proper management (which is really just a re-statement of the problem - clearer barriers here are policies for agricultural expansion etc. that don't integrate conservation concerns and lack of capacity for environmental management), absence of environmentally-friendly alternative livelihoods (better placed here than as a root cause), and lack of awareness about the dragon and other species among local communities, governments, tourist industry, etc. In terms of the livelihoods point, the description is rather confusing, with biodiversity financing models, integrated planning and livelihood options all discussed together in no clear order.</p> <p>It would be helpful for the reader to simply describe barriers to change in this section, leaving description of interventions to later sections. The final barrier is not well described at all, with the text here being mainly about existence of traditional knowledge. There is some data and references presented in these sections, but very little that tell us anything concrete about land use patterns and aspects of ecosystem degradation. Figure 1 is rather confusing - it appears to show the barriers as contributing to the threats, rather than being barriers to change. However, the links</p>

		between drivers, direct threats, and impacts is very clear and useful. (There's no need to try to put all the barriers/threats/drivers into one diagram if they don't lend themselves well to this.)
	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?	The baseline sets out a number of past and current initiatives. It appears there are many quite positive things happening addressing the particular problems addressed in this PIF, and interventions that overlap in scope with the components of this project - it would therefore be helpful to have a clearer sense of what these are expected to achieve over coming years in order to understand where the gaps are, and how this project adds to what is already happening.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	This is not particularly clear.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	This could be much clearer.
	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	No, this is weak. There are clearly many initiatives that have or are seeking to achieve similar objectives to this project - what has been learned? What has worked, what has not worked and why? All this is fundamental reasoning to support this project.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	See above.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected	What is the theory of change?	A graphic TOC diagram is presented which is a good initial step. However, it is constrained by grouping the outputs into the components of the logframe, rather than arranging them in a logical

<p>outcomes and components of the project</p>		<p>sequence showing what sequence of steps need to be achieved in order to achieve the impact. For example, it is clear that achieving outcome 2 (new pro-conservation livelihoods) contributes to achieving outcome 1 (effective species conservation), as these livelihoods will reduce human impacts on dragons and generate funding for conservation. Similarly, won't output 3.2 (Komodo research) contribute directly to outcome 1 (species conservation)?</p> <p>Outcome 3 in this diagram is poorly integrated with the rest of the TOC - some of these outputs are just about project management, but the research output needs a clear outcome that contributes to achieving the impact (establishing a research center is just one step - but to what? The TOC needs to show how this contributes to the whole. TOCs do not need to follow the same component structure as your logframe (and if they do, they are unlikely to capture the complexity of the real project logic, with all the cross-linkages and interdependencies involved in most projects) - please see the STAP Primer on TOCs in this regard. The narrative explanation of the TOC is actually much clearer, although it doesn't align very clearly with the graphic TOC.</p>
	<p>What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?</p>	<p>The basic logic is that (paraphrasing the TOC narrative) strengthened, integrated management of multiple-use landscapes, plus the development and establishment of new sustainable livelihood options and biofinancing mechanisms, will lead to conservation of Komodo dragon and other threatened species plus the additional benefit of improved community livelihoods.</p>
	<p>What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?</p>	<p>Component 1 aims to strengthen on-ground integrated management of forests/habitats across the landscape through i. establishing a multi-stakeholder governance platform; ii. integration of biodiversity considerations into economic sectors</p>

		<p>(tourism/grazing/agriculture etc.); iii. establishing the KEE management concept into on-ground practice (including mapping and land use planning) in pilot areas; and iv. improved Komodo monitoring.</p> <p>Component 2 includes a number of elements that are not very clearly linked. However, this component aims to mobilise private sector financing for conservation plus community livelihoods, and support community-based sustainable enterprises, plus encourage captive breeding to reduce hunting; through i. developing a consultative Komodo conservation plan, ii. and iii. develop and implement economically viable biodiversity-friendly economic options for communities/small businesses, linked with bio-financing instruments, iv. practical support for community enterprises, v. development of a long-term financing strategy and vi. capacity building.</p> <p>Component 3 focuses on project management aspects of knowledge management, gender mainstreaming and MEL, but also appears to involve mobilising research partnerships.</p>
	<p>Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?</p>	<p>Yes, they seem plausible, although it is hard to judge given that the problem is not particularly well described (see above). However, the requirements for supporting and enabling community-based or co-management of these landscapes should be carefully thought through.</p> <p>The effective incentivisation and engagement of local communities in management of lands and resources will be critical to achieving this project's impacts. The STAP paper Global Commons, Local Benefits sets out a series of recommendations for supporting such management - these should be carefully considered at PPG phase. Notably, in the narrative on output 2.4 there is little (although</p>

		<p>some) attention to rights, empowerment, governance - these issues are critical to success of community NR management regimes. The kinds of enterprises for communities to adopt must be chosen by communities themselves - otherwise they are unlikely to be successful or widely adopted, so the forms these enterprises may take should be left to be determined through an inclusive process.</p> <p>Reliance on tourism appears increasingly tenuous in current global circumstances - it may be that sustainable uses of wild or cultivated resources (plants/animals) may be more resilient to global shocks. The relative merits of captive breeding deer vs promoting more sustainable approaches of wild harvest should be considered carefully, with the risks and benefits of each considered. If this is for trade rather than own-use there are complex dynamics to be considered - e.g. around markets, demand, benefit distribution, incentives (for illegal activity, for habitat conservation, for selective breeding etc.) as well as disease risk.</p> <p>Assumptions are identified in the TOC diagram, but other critical assumptions could be identified, such as that conservation friendly enterprises that do generate sufficient income without damaging biodiversity can be found; that governance mechanisms are adequate to ensure effective, equitable management of these areas; that no unexpected threats (e.g. disease) negative affect the Komodo population; that livelihood interventions shift the activities of enough people in a large enough way to change the land and resource use patterns that are impacting on the dragon and other species, etc.</p>
	<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?</p>	<p>No, this is not clearly addressed.</p>

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 successful, these appear significant benefits to be delivered, and enable the piloting of mechanisms and approaches that could be effective elsewhere in Indonesia.
	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?	Yes, in principle, but the data and information presented here suggest they will be hard to measure, as the baseline level of threat is not well described here (e.g. dynamics of forest loss, land use intensification, habitat degradation etc.)
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	The GEF investment is 6.3 m, in order to achieve 64K ha of improved PA management and 123K ha of marine areas better managed, 300 ha of forest restored, 267K ha of land better managed. In addition, 994K t C mitigated. This appears reasonable, particularly in light of the piloting of innovative biodiversity financing mechanisms that have long-term potential for wider uptake and impact.
	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?	Yes.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	These are discussed under risks, and assessment of climate change risks and needs is mainly to carried out at PPG phase.
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?	It contains important innovative elements, such as multi-stakeholder governance of multi-function landscapes, conservation finance instruments. It refers to supporting IPLCs to manage their lands for biodiversity, which is innovative, although with little clarity about the obstacles they currently face and how they would be supported.

	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Scaling across institutional actors on Flores is reasonably clearly articulated, and the potential for scaling to other geographic regions is described adequately.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	This aims at transformational change, through changing forms of governance and economic incentives.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		These are provided for the western area, but not the north.
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, this appears to be comprehensive.
	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?	These are clearly articulated.
3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Yes, this is well done.

<p>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>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	<p>Yes.</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? 	<p>A wide range of risks addressing many different facets of the project are discussed, although specifics of how many will be addressed is left to PPG phase.</p> <p>A climate risk assessment will be undertaken during PPG phase.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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?	No -only from one project (Lestari), and the lessons don't appear particularly relevant to this project.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	No.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Only as above.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Not in any apparent way.
	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?	No, this is rather weak. Other related initiatives are mentioned but no clear way to share lessons with them are outlined, and mechanisms to capture lessons from previous projects are not described.
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 remains rather vague in the description.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	These are not clearly articulated.

Notes

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
<p>1. Concur</p>	<p>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.</p>
	<p>* 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></p>
<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>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:</p>
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p>
	<p>(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.</p>
	<p>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>

<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>