**REVISED STAP SCREENING TEMPLATE, OCTOBER 2022**

| GEF ID | 11530 |
|---|---|
| Project title | Strengthening the integrated landscape management and governance for the conservation and sustainable use of forested areas important for biodiversity and ecosystem services (AIBDES) in Indonesia |
| Date of screen | November 26, 2024 |
| STAP Panel Member | Sandy Andelman |
| STAP Secretariat | Alessandro Moscuzza |

1. **Summary of STAP's views of the project**

The project will focus on areas important for biodiversity and ecosystem services (AIBDES) in Indonesia and aims to strengthen integrated landscape management and governance to conserve and sustainably use AIBDES, thereby contributing to global biodiversity conservation efforts. The logic for the components is generally clear, at least at a high level.

The proposal makes a reasonable case for the intervention but has several weaknesses that will need to be addressed during the next stage of project development. The main one is the failure to identify all of the main threats to target species and incorporate interventions that will directly address all of the threats (see below). A key assumption seems to be that the main threat to these species is forest conversion. However, since poaching and illegal trade also are important threats, this assumption should be re-evaluated in the next phase of project design.

Among other key sections of the proposal, STAP has also identified areas for improvement in the theory of change (ToC) and description of the components, which are discussed further below in sections 2 and 3 of this document.

*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 **project summary** provides a basic description of the problems and issues to be addressed, which was adequate for a PIF but should be expanded in the final proposal to include more details about some of the other aspects listed in the PIF guidance (e.g. project objectives, whether the project intends to be transformative, what are the GEBs or adaptation benefits it will deliver and how).

The **project rationale** provides an adequate description of the environmental situation and problems affecting Indonesia, which is supported by a good amount of evidence from referenced sources.

The **project description** is basic and does not provide sufficient information to understand the system and all of its interrelationships in full. The **baseline** is partially defined and the rationale for selecting specific target species in each landscape is not explicit. All of the key threats to these species also need to be considered, and the

interventions need to target the main threats specifically, not just a subset of them.  This has implications for the TOC, which needs to be revised accordingly.

The proposal provides a description of a **possible future** under a business as usual (BAU) scenario and an alternative scenario (AS)  where the project delivers some improvements. Whilst the description fo the BAU is acceptable if also very basic, the description of the AS is not convincing and does fail to provide a compelling picture of what the project will achieve and whether it would make any real difference on the ground in real terms.

The **theory of change (TOC)** is not sufficiently specific, and a lack of detail on causal pathways makes it difficult to evaluate. Specific recommendations are included in section 3 below. The **ToC diagram** is visually effective and presents a good overall structure for the project components that flows well, although the content will need to be revised and adjusted in line with the recommendation in section 3 below.

The description of the **project components** is often vague and does not provide any concrete details of what the project is intending to do in terms of activities and how.  For example, under **component 2** *"Integrated landscape-level governance for sustainable biodiversity management in Areas Important for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (AIBDES) outside PAs*" **2.1.3** entails "*implementation support for biodiversity conservation policies*" which does not provide any real explanation of what this would involve in term of activities or any tangible outputs/outcomes it would deliver. The same applies to **2.1.4** "*Capacity needs assessment"*, which is defined as "*identifying and assessing capacity gaps at local and regional governance levels to enhance administrative and technical capabilities for biodiversity management"*; and **2.5 Utilization of decision-support tools,** which is vaguely defined as "*deploying spatially explicit decision-support tools to optimize management decisions".* Components 4 and 5 are affected by the very same issue with subcomponents 4.1, 4.1.3, 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.1.3, and 5.1.4 also failing to provide a convincing explanation for what they will deliver in concrete terms and how.

The **private sector** is expected to be an important source of finance. However, all of the indicative project co-finance comes from the national government and none from the private sector.  Explain how private sector finance will be mobilized and how it will be used.

An explicit analysis of **potential tradeoffs** between livelihood improvements and biodiversity outcomes would strengthen the project design. Although the narrative states that the project will build on prior investments and complement current investments, incorporating **lessons learned**, what these lessons are is not clear, and it is also unclear **how** the project will build on prior investments and complement other current investments.

*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

1.  These project summary and project description sections of the proposal should be revised and expanded to provide more detailed information.

2.  The definition of Areas Important for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (AIBDES) needs to be more comprehensive, including descriptions of criteria and methods used to "verify" them, which apparently has already been done. Also, explain why it is important to define AIBDES both within and outside of protected areas, especially since the project seems to focus on AIBDES outside, not inside PAs.

3.  One of the project core indicators is number of protected areas created, however, the narrative suggests that no new PAs will be created, unless these refer to new AIBDESs? This should be clarified.

4. Target species have been identified, which is good to see, but the table and narrative need to indicate the rationale for selecting target species (e.g. is it because they are threatened or endangered? Or is it because they play a key role in the landscapes?)

5. Appropriate indicators should be identified for each target species and the rationale for their selection should be described, e.g., the Sunda pangolin is mentioned as a target species, but there is no indicator.

6. A key assumption underlying the project seems to be that the main threats to the target species forest conversion and fragmentation, however there are other important threats (e.g. the main threats to pangolins, leopards and Javan eagles include poaching and illegal trade). Please make these explicit in the TOC and narrative.

7. Please explain how the interventions will address the main threats to the target species, forest conversion and fragmentation. The main strategy seems to be restoration of isolated ecosystems to promote connectivity, but other threats also need to be addressed, including articulating the causal pathways. This includes clarifying how livelihood activities (e.g. rubber tapping, oil palm plantations) are compatible with biodiversity conservation. Will the proposed regulations limit/prevent the conversion of native forests to these uses?

8. Outcome 1.1.2 should be rewritten to explain how it will align with GBF and GEF focal area biodiversity targets rather than just mentioning biodiversity.

9. The next phase of project design should include Outcome 1.1.1. This policy review and analysis is needed as part of the project design to inform the selection and design of interventions. It cannot wait, at least not entirely, until project implementation.

10. Similarly, the design of indicators in 5.1.6 needs to happen during the PPG phase, with clear methods and frequency for data collection, as well as a description of the rationale for their selection.

11. The ToC narrative mentions interlinkages between components, but these are not explicitly incorporated in the ToC diagram. For example, in the TOC, the linkages between Component 5, especially 5.1.6, and Components 3 and 4 need to be explicit to fully understand the pathways from interventions to impact. Also, robust monitoring (Component 5) is required to evaluate the success of biodiversity conservation measures and the level of ecosystem resilience (Components 3 and 4).

12. The causal pathway for gender engagement and outcomes should be clarified in the TOC diagram and narrative.

13. To address the need for adaptive management, as well as to understand feedbacks between different interventions and components, adaptive management and potential feedbacks need to be made explicit in both the TOC diagram and narrative.

14. Outcome 4.1.2. Integration of livelihood improvements with biodiversity gains: Implement projects that enhance livelihoods through sustainable practices that also contribute to biodiversity, such as sustainable agroforestry and ecological forestry techniques that increase habitat connectivity and species diversity. This needs further text to describe the specific interventions and causal pathways.

15. Reference is made to a broader set of development objectives, socio-economic gains, and cultural co-benefits. Define and describe these.

16. The table describing related projects is useful, however additional columns are needed to indicate the main interventions and the nature of the linkages to this project

**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.)