REVISED STA P SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022

GEF ID	11422
Project title	Lake Ecosystem Restoration in Indonesia through Integrated Governance, Landscape, and Community-based Approaches
Date of screen	18 January 2024
STAP Panel Member	John Donaldson
STAP Secretariat	Alessandro Moscuzza

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

STAP's review concluded that this is a sound proposal, which advocates for the achievement of global environmental benefits from the restoration and improved management of important lake ecosystems. Overall, the project description sets out a strong rationale and presents a reasonably well thought out theory of change with three causal pathways leading to institutional and behavioral change.

Some of the components are still largely conceptual and it is not possible to fully assess their scientific merits or technical feasibility. STAP has identified some specific issues, especially relating to demonstration sites under Component 2, where scientific and technical details should be clarified during the next phase of project development.

Other areas where STAP recommends further consideration are: the identification of barriers for scaling of solutions from demonstration site; and the development of knowledge management systems that are strongly aligned with the strategic outcomes being planned under Components 1 & 2.

In summary, STAP's assessment is that this proposal can proceed to the next stage of development and that the scientific and technical points identified under Section 3 should be addressed during the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) phase.

Note to STAP screeners: a summary of STAP's view of the project (not of the project itself), covering both strengths and weaknesses.

STAP's assessment*

□ Concur - STAP acknowledges that the concept has scientific and technical merit

Minor - STAP has identified some scientific and technical points to be addressed in project design

□ Major - STAP has identified significant concerns to be addressed in project design

Please contact the STAP Secretariat if you would like to discuss.

2. Project rationale, and project description – are they sound?

See annex on STAP's screening guidelines.

The PIF lays out a solid **rationale** for a GEF investment in the restoration and management of lake ecosystems in Indonesia. The evidence for the **global environmental benefits** that are specifically gained from the lake ecosystems is dispersed across sections of the document (much more coherent for the socio-economic co-benefits) but is sufficient. The threats facing these ecosystems are clearly identified, as is the persistent problem of weak integration of lake ecosystem management despite several government decrees and strategies, and these initiatives are explained in the **baseline** description.

The project's **objectives** are clear and the **theory of change** outlines three causal pathways to achieve more enduring changes to the way lake ecosystems are managed. The narrative description of the TOC is very brief but is accompanied by an informative TOC diagram. The PIF notes the intention to further develop the TOC during the PPG phase and this is necessary to ensure that the barriers have been properly identified (see comments on scaling under Section 3), and to analyze some of the assumptions.

The description of the **components** also gives a reasonable idea of the interventions and what they are designed to deliver relative to the project objectives. Component 2, which comprises interventions linked to demonstration sites, includes a wide range of ideas and possibilities but the information provided is not sufficient to determine whether the scientific and technical issues have been fully considered for any of these possibilities. The design of this component will need to be carefully evaluated during the PPG phase to clarify the strategic value of different options, as well as their scientific merit and technical feasibility (see Section 3).

Component 3 acknowledges the importance of **knowledge management and learning** as a critical aspect of achieving the overall objectives, which are fundamentally about **institutional and behavioral** change in the way people manage lake ecosystems. The detail regarding Component 3 is not sufficient to determine what exactly is included but it will be important for the design of this component to be strongly integrated with the outputs of Components 1 & 2, especially to ensure that all the relevant aspects of integrated management can be effectively measured and monitored, and that the main levers for behavioral change have been properly identified.

Note: provide a general appraisal, asking whether relevant screening guideline questions have been addressed adequately – not all the questions will be relevant to all proposals; no need to comment on every question, only those needing more attention, noting any done very well, but ensure that all are considered. Comments should be helpful, evaluative, and qualitative, rather than yes/no.

3. Specific points to be addressed, and suggestions.

The further development of the project should consider the following issues.

- Clarify the strategic intention of the demonstration sites. The project rationale alludes to the need to show that integrated catchment management delivers multiple benefits. Does this mean demonstrating only how integration happens (which addresses the main barrier) and measuring the collective outcomes (e.g. better water quality); or does it mean demonstrating the feasibility of each element in the design of catchment management systems (e.g. success of livelihood options, impacts of agricultural practices, methods to control invasive species)? The answer to this question is critical to determine what needs to be monitored, measured, and properly documented in knowledge management systems (Component 3).

- Determine how comprehensive the demonstrations need to be to have an impact, especially if they are being used to identify scalable solutions. Relevant questions to guide such an assessment would be: *does change need to happen across the entire demonstration site to have an impact (10,000 ha – 93,000ha)? How many people/ households would need to adopt relevant strategies to ensure wider uptake? How many different solutions would need to be trialed? Does the entire value chain for the NBS need to be developed and tested?*

- Clarify whether the proposed interventions in demonstration sites will be based on known and tested approaches versus those that must be developed and tested as part of the demonstration sites (e.g. methods for control of invasive species, options for NBS, livelihood options, restoration methods). Each of these elements could represent considerable uncertainty unless proven methods are implemented. For

example, control of water hyacinth has failed in many parts of the world[1] and it will be important to ensure that proposed interventions are informed by the latest available science.

- Ensure that livelihood interventions under Component 2 are aligned with best practices to avoid negative outcomes and ensure they are designed to deliver the intended environmental benefits. Further guidance on this topic can be found in the recently published STAP background note on alternative livelihoods.

- Consider how scaling will happen and how this affects the design of the demonstration projects. Scaling is included under Component 3, where it is assumed that the main constraint is lack of knowledge. As a result, the solution is to provide access to knowledge. This could end up being a circular argument unless there is clear evidence that lack of knowledge is the only constraint to uptake and scaling, instead of lack of resources, institutional capacity, rights and power to implement changes or other socio-cultural or socio-economic factors. It would be important for the project to test this assumption and to identify all options for scaling as part of a strategy that could be developed during the PPG phase. Further guidance on scaling interventions to deliver systemic change and durable global environmental benefits can be found in the STAP advisory document on Achieving Transformation Through GEF Investments.

Note: number key points clearly and provide useful information or suggestions, including key literature where relevant. Completed screens should be no more than two or three pages in length.

*categories under review, subject to future revision

[1] Metogbe Belfrid Djihouessi, Mark Olokotum, Louis Claude Chabi, Fohla Mouftaou, Martin Pepin Aina, Paradigm shifts for sustainable management of water hyacinth in tropical ecosystems: A review and overview of current challenges, Environmental Challenges, Volume 11, 2023

ANNEX: STAP'S SCREENING GUIDELINES

1. How well does the proposal explain the problem and issues to be addressed in the context of the **system** within which the problem sits and its drivers (e.g. population growth, economic development, climate change, sociocultural and political factors, and technological changes), including how the various components of the system interact?

2. Does the project indicate how **uncertain futures** could unfold (e.g. using simple **narratives)**, based on an understanding of the trends and interactions between the key elements of the system and its drivers?

3. Does the project describe the **baseline** problem and how it may evolve in the future in the absence of the project; and then identify the outcomes that the project seeks to achieve, how these outcomes will change the baseline, and what the key **barriers** and **enablers** are to achieving those outcomes?

4. Are the project's **objectives** well formulated and justified in relation to this system context? Is there a convincing explanation as to **why this particular project** has been selected in preference to other options, in the light of how the future may unfold?

5. How well does the **theory of change** provide an "explicit account of how and why the proposed interventions would achieve their intended outcomes and goal, based on outlining a set of key causal pathways arising from the activities and outputs of the interventions and the assumptions underlying these causal connections".

    - Does the project logic show how the project would ensure that expected outcomes are **enduring** and resilient to possible future changes identified in question 2 above, and to the effects of any conflicting policies (see question 9 below).
    - Is the theory of change grounded on a **solid scientific foundation**, and is it aligned with current scientific knowledge?
    - Does it explicitly consider how any necessary **institutional and behavioral** changes are to be achieved?
    - Does the **theory of change diagram** convincingly show the overall project logic, including causal pathways and outcomes?

6. Are the project **components** (interventions and activities) identified in the theory of change each described in sufficient detail to discern the main thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they address the problem, their justification as a robust solution, and the critical assumptions and risks to achieving them?

7. How likely is the project to generate global environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF project (**additionality**)?

8. Does the project convincingly identify the relevant **stakeholders**, and their anticipated roles and responsibilities? is there an adequate explanation of how stakeholders will contribute to the

development and implementation of the project, and how they will benefit from the project to ensure enduring global environmental benefits, e.g. through co-benefits?

9. Does the description adequately explain:

   - how the project will build on prior investments and complement current investments, both GEF and non-GEF,
   - how the project incorporates **lessons learned** from previous projects in the country and region, and more widely from projects addressing similar issues elsewhere; and
   - how country policies that are contradictory to the intended outcomes of the project (identified in section C) will be addressed (**policy coherence**)?

10. How adequate is the project's approach to generating, managing and exchanging **knowledge**, and how will lessons learned be captured for adaptive management and for the benefit of future projects?

11. **Innovation and transformation:**
    - If the project is intended to be **innovative:** to what degree is it innovative, how will this ambition be achieved, how will barriers and enablers be addressed, and how might scaling be achieved?
    - If the project is intended to be **transformative:** how well do the project's objectives contribute to transformative change, and are they sufficient to contribute to enduring, transformational change at a sufficient scale to deliver a step improvement in one or more GEBs? Is the proposed logic to achieve the goal credible, addressing necessary changes in institutions, social or cultural norms? Are barriers and enablers to scaling be addressed? And how will enduring scaling be achieved?

12. Have **risks** to the project design and implementation been identified appropriately in the risk table in section B, and have suitable mitigation measures been incorporated? (NB: risks to the durability of project outcomes from future changes in drivers should have been reflected in the theory of change and in project design, not in this table.)