

# Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility  
(Version 5)

## STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: October 31, 2017  
Screener: Sarah Lebel  
Panel member validation by: Annette Cowie  
Consultant(s):

### I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

<b>FULL-SIZED PROJECT</b>	<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>
<b>GEF PROJECT ID:</b>	9600
<b>PROJECT DURATION:</b>	6
<b>COUNTRIES:</b>	Indonesia
<b>PROJECT TITLE:</b>	Strengthening of Social Forestry in Indonesia
<b>GEF AGENCIES:</b>	World Bank
<b>OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:</b>	Ministry of Environment and Forestry (in cooperation with National Geospatial Agency, Ministry of Villages, Ministry of Agraria and Spatial Planning, National Development and Planning Agency, Ministry of Home Affairs (including local governments at province and district level), Ministry of Villages
<b>GEF FOCAL AREA:</b>	Multi Focal Area

### II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):  
**Major issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the World Bank proposal "Strengthening of Social Forestry in Indonesia". The project's stated objective is to "improve community management of forest in select priority areas and to conserve biodiversity of global significance". The project documents do not provide sufficient information for STAP to assess the scientific and technical merit of the proposal. STAP has some specific concerns, outlined below, which should be addressed as the project moves forward.

1. The logic of the project is not clear. The baseline includes two apparently unrelated components, on mapping of land tenure and social forestry. From the information provided, it is not clear how the proposal will deliver the stated outcome of conserving biodiversity of global significance. The project intends to transfer ownership of degraded land to local communities, with the intention that this will "convert degraded forest land into well managed forest". More information is required on the strategy for identifying land that is suitable for restoration, and the mechanisms that will be implemented to achieve the stated biodiversity benefits, with due recognition of the challenges of land restoration in this context.
2. The project proposes to intervene in what appears to be an already crowded field, with several projects and programs already under way. More clarity is required on how this project proposes to complement and support those existing initiatives.

3. There appears to be little logic to the proposed interventions and certainly no justifications or scientific evidence to support them. Several sub-components have repetitive descriptions and seem to overlap without actually being linked to each other (e.g. Sub-component 1.2 (iv) and Sub-component 2.1 (i) both address the issuance of land rights to communities). Other components are simply a list of possible interventions, presented with no clarity on what global environmental benefits are to be delivered. For example, Sub-component 2.2 states that "these investments are to increase the forest area and biomass coverage, enhance land management and/or contribute to biodiversity conservation". Also, Sub-component 2.2 includes the following list of unrelated practices, objectives and activities: "mulching, contour, terracing; reducing human wildlife conflicts; training and equipping community groups for guarding, monitoring encroachment, reporting, fire detection and early suppression, fire management and reporting, etc". STAP expects to see a clearly articulated logical relationship between the project goal, identified problems and the planned interventions, with a strategic approach to their implementation.

4. The project proposal document at one point notes the need for the One Map Policy (which relates to this project in an unclear manner) to "include all state, communal and private stakeholders in each territory". This appears to be an ambitious goal, perhaps unachievable. STAP notes that while stakeholder engagement is crucial, especially when it comes to land tenure issues, it is essential to consider engaging the right people, in the right way, and at the right time. More guidance on multi-stakeholder engagement and governance can be found in STAP's recent "Guidelines for embedding resilience, adaptation and transformation into sustainable development projects (RAPTA)", available here: <http://stapgef.org/rapta-guidelines>.

5. Under Sub-component 1.3, it is noted that the project would "generate lessons learned to date from social forestry in Indonesia as well as draw lessons from other countries to contribute to the achievement of the project objective". This description would hardly qualify as "generating knowledge", as it appears it is merely about collating existing information. Should the project proponents rather want to generate knowledge from this project, STAP would recommend exploring the possibility of integrating a formal component on Knowledge Management. STAP encourages the project developers to consult its ongoing advice on Knowledge Management to the GEF at <http://www.stapgef.org/knowledge-management-gef> as well as some of the knowledge management tools that are currently recommended – see, for example <http://www.knowledge-management-tools.net/knowledge-management-systems.html>.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple "Concur" response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP's concerns.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the</p>

	full project brief for CEO endorsement.
--	---