

STAP guidelines for screening GEF projects

Part I: Project Information	Response
GEF ID	10511
Project Title	Crop Diversity Conservation for Sustainable Use in Indonesia
Date of Screening	20 May 2020
STAP member screener	Rosie Cooney
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski
STAP Overall Assessment and Rating	<p>Minor</p> <p>STAP welcomes this proposal to conserve Indonesia’s outstanding diverse plant genetic resources for food and agriculture.</p> <p>There are many important elements in the proposal; however, overall the project requires considerable further work to provide reassurance that it has a high chance of achieving its objective.</p> <p>The proposal is unclear and not well organized, making it difficult to work out the internal logic of the intervention. The Theory of Change (TOC) provided is not adequate. STAP strongly recommends that a robust, participatory TOC is developed, with a focus on clarifying key outcomes that represent changes in the state of the world that project action brings about, which lead clearly to the achievement of the final objective. The linkage of the Nagoya Protocol to the rest of the project is unclear. The incentives that are necessary to drive farmer practice toward conservation of diverse traditional landraces are unclear.</p> <p>There appears to be very heavy reliance on an assumption that provision of information about benefits of traditional varieties will be adequate to create a market for them: no evidence is provided to substantiate this.</p> <p>STAP recommends a thorough review and revision of project design in the light of development of a comprehensive TOC,</p>

	plus careful evaluation of the feasibility of the underlying assumptions.	
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?	
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project’s objectives?	
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention. Do the planned outcomes encompass important adaptation benefits?	A number of the outcomes are written more like outputs, and should be re-written to more clearly and specifically indicate what “state of the world” the project intends to bring about. For example, 2.3 “Improving the linkages between ex situ and in situ conservation and on-farm management of PGRFA efforts” could be written as something like “Conservation of PGRFA (in situ and ex situ) and their on farm management are linked”. This still needs more detail – in what way? How closely linked? Likewise, in 2.1 and 2.2, for example, reference is made to “use” of outputs and capacities being built, but who should be using these, and whose capacities should be built? While this may seem trivial, having clear outputs captures what success looks like, and making these clearer would make it much easier to know if one had achieved them or not. STAP recommends all outputs are revised to clearly and more specifically indicate what state of the world the project intends to bring about. Likewise at component level – particularly component 3 is essentially a list of what is done within it (“Mainstreaming diversity of local varieties through biological, sociocultural and economic evaluation and the development of market/non-market incentives and linkages in target sites”) – why? To achieve what? Mainstreaming is not an

		end in itself – it is done to achieve biodiversity goals – what are they here?
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	
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?	
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?	<p>The problem statement is not clearly written and is poorly organized. There is no clear structure or delineation of context, threats, root causes and barriers, and much material about the content of the project all jumbled up with the problem statement in this section. Later, in the “alternative scenario” section, there is more detail provided about the problem. The key problem addressed in the project, however, is loss of PGRFA, required for food security and adaptation to climate change. Additional problems (possibly barriers) identified include lack of coordination in implementation regulations, lack of coherence of laws/regs across sectors, and gaps in Nagoya Protocol implementation. There is no explanation of how better Nagoya Protocol implementation will assist in conserving PGRFA.</p> <p>There is virtually no description or explanation in the problem statement regarding current trends in PGRFA and what factors currently threaten their conservation, although a little more detail is provided later in the “alternative scenario” section. The Green Revolution is highlighted as driving increasing crop genetic uniformity, and its ideology and practices could usefully be drawn out as among the root causes (also if there is ongoing support for this approach that could be identified</p>

		<p>as a barrier). The problem analysis also needs to identify and discuss whatever factors are driving the loss of PGRFA to agriculture, forestry, etc, as indicated in the pif. The lack of detail about drivers of the problem makes it hard to assess whether the measures proposed are appropriate to address the problem.</p> <p>Some of the site selection criteria set out in this section are hard to understand e.g. “The extent to which in situ conservation in each site will be sustainable, and sustainably used to support biodiversity conservation” (How do you know?).</p> <p>All this material should be re-structured so there is a concise, non-repetitive problem statement that sets out the current situation (i.e. what threatens PGRFA), what root causes drive this, and what barriers mean changing this situation is difficult. All the material about project design should be moved to the “Alternative scenario” section.</p>
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Not well described – see above.
	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?	
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Reasonably clear.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project’s benefits?	Adequate.

	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Adequate.
	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;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	No. There are no lessons from previous projects described.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	See above.
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	There is an explicit graphic theory of change, which is a start, but it needs considerable further development to constitute a useful TOC. The TOC needs to show the logical steps in a project – what leads to what. This TOC is simply a re-wording and re-arrangement of the components/outputs/outcomes, with no clarity on logical links. STAP strongly recommends that the project developers review the STAP TOC Primer (https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer) for guidance on developing an adequate TOC. A TOC should take a systems approach and illustrate how interventions sequentially lead to outcomes that together produce the overall objective. Note that outputs will often contribute to several outcomes, within the same or other components; certain outcomes may be dependent on the prior achievement of other outcomes (again, within the same or other project components); and specific assumptions underlie specific connections between outputs and outcomes. These can all be worked through and clarified by a good TOC. Note that in this TOC there does not appear to be any necessary connection between the impacts and the achievement of the overall objective. The impacts as they are written here don't necessarily have anything to do with high/maintained

		<p>conserved PGRFA. One should be able to look at the list of outcomes (here- impacts) and see that they clearly and logically add up to achieving the Objective. A TOC may have a number of steps in it which do not appear in your lists of outcomes/outputs in your description of project components. For example, a key step in achieving the project's objectives is that provincial/district governments implement PGRFA conservation strategies – this would appear in a TOC as a necessary step toward achieving your objective. The assumptions set out in the TOC are very general – probably too general to be useful in planning. There are many more specific assumptions that underpin the logic of the project. For example, Output 1.3 will only contribute to the overall objective if the recommendations made to provincial governments are actually implemented – such implementation is an important assumption to be highlighted in a TOC (and monitored during project implementation).</p>
	<p>What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?</p>	<p>See above and below – these are not always clear or complete.</p>
	<p>What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?</p>	<p>Its very hard to understand the difference between Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2. Under outcome 1.1, why is harmonization only being pursued in relation to Nagoya Protocol issues? Surely there are many other aspects to promoting conservation/SU of PGRFA that will need to be harmonized?</p> <p>Re Component 1, do the relevant officials have the capacity and understanding to put into practice these policies and recommendations?</p> <p>The organization of outputs and outcomes does not appear logical at points. For example, outcome 2.1 involves production of methodologies for CWR conservation. Yet much work in output 2.1.1 is not</p>

		<p>about methodologies, but about mapping and characterization of landraces to prioritize interventions.</p> <p>Outcome 2.2 is about increasing incentive-based approaches, but the outputs are all about capacity-building and training. What are the incentives for communities to conserve PGRFA?</p> <p>Outcome 2.3 refers to improving linkages between in situ and ex situ conservation, but there doesn't appear to be any explanation of what sort of links are being referred to, why they are necessary or how they will help conservation.</p> <p>Sometimes the text is just difficult to understand e.g. "Activities will promote in situ– ex situ linkages in effective conservation of the selected species as they are found in existing protected areas, but they are not being actively monitored and managed". Re-writing for simplicity and clarity would be beneficial.</p> <p>The outputs/outcomes under component 3 do not fit well under its title, which indicates it is about evaluation. The activities here include evaluation but also quite different activities, such as marketing.</p> <p>In component 4 there are issues around intellectual property in traditional knowledge, that need to be treated carefully, given the emphasis on documenting and disseminating this knowledge.</p> <p>Component 4 is very broad and quite unclear. What are the actual outcomes of this component? The language of the outcomes here is more like</p>
--	--	---

		<p>that of outputs, and tells us very little about what changes in the state of the world this work (that contribute to the overall objective) are intended to be achieved. Exactly what sorts of knowledge, to be used by whom, for what purpose, and how does this contribute to the objective? There is much vague language here with little articulation of clear causal chains that promote the objective. There are also some elements that are hard to understand in this context e.g. what is the “innovative research” referred to in para 2?</p>
	<p>Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?</p>	<p>The project appears to lack explanation/ articulation of critical logical links, particularly what incentives farmers will have to conserve and sustainably use diverse landraces rather than monotypical industrial crops. This is clearly a critical part of the project – otherwise it is just a lot of inventorying/evaluation/capacity-building/policy reform activities.</p> <p>The project refers repeatedly to incentives, but it is really unclear what these are or what activities are aimed at increasing incentives. It refers to demand-driven conservation, but no evidence is presented that there is a demand for relevant products, or that this is a viable and realistic possibility.</p> <p>This issue is returned to in the “Innovation” section, where the most coherent explanation of the logic of the project is set out. At this point the text makes clear that a market for landraces will be established through disseminating information about the benefits of these products. This seems highly risky, unless there is a sound basis for thinking that this market can be created. No</p>

		<p>results of market research are presented to support this possibility.</p> <p>If bioprospecting/ABS is being relied on to generate incentives for conservation, careful analysis of global experience should be undertaken, as this has largely failed to deliver much in the way of incentives for biodiversity conservation (see e.g. https://science.sciencemag.org/content/367/6483/1200).</p> <p>Again, a good TOC would illustrate the roles of incentives, capacity and supportive policy in shifting this system toward a more desirable state.</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?	No, none is evident.
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 these activities successfully achieved their objective, it would lead to the delivery of GEBs.
	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?	If achieved, these GEBs would be truly global.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	This is quite a large GEF investment and requires more careful and convincing planning.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits explicitly defined?	Yes, they are reasonably well defined.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Only ha of land in which in situ conservation will take place.

	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	None are specified.
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?	Adopting an incentive-driven approach to encourage farmers and other constituencies to conserve/sustainably use PGRFA would be innovative, but the mechanisms to do this set out here are not very convincing.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	The strong element of policy reform and creating an enabling institutional environment is welcome and would contribute to scaling over time and durability of outcomes. National/international scaling is envisaged through e.g. formation of Indonesian hubs on this issue.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The project is aiming for transformational change.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Included.
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	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	It is notable that local communities will be key actors in the success of the project, but have not been directly consulted (and only indirectly consulted in certain project areas) in development of the project. It would be reassuring to know that there was local support for and interest in this project, and that this project design reflected the priorities and perspectives of local communities whose knowledge and practices are the key focus of it. Local communities are not listed as stakeholders and no role in the project is defined for them, which is a major oversight, and again not reassuring regarding the thinking of project designers about their role as key actors here.

<p>the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>		<p>Otherwise, the private sector are likewise key actors in the project, particularly regarding building markets and supply chains for products from traditional landraces, but are not identified here.</p>
	<p>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>	<p>See above.</p>
<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. 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, and the response measures appear appropriate.</p>

	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	See above.
<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? • 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? 	<p>The potential lack of government support (at various levels) for traditional landraces seems like an important risk, and the response measures here do not seem adequate (and are very hard to understand). Likewise, the market risks appear considerable, and again the response measures are weak. It is simply asserted that farmers will benefit from agricultural diversity due to market and business plans – but will plans necessarily translate into economic advantage? Presumably it was the market advantages of industrial varieties that led to their wide uptake – what economic benefits will counter this? The risk of losing government financing given Covid constraints is likewise serious, with little provided in the way of response.</p> <p>There is some climate risk screening undertaken here, but it is quite superficial. For example, given the shifts in local climates, local performance and yield of crops should be expected to change – how does this sit with the emphasis on mapping landraces and their performance characteristics? Presumably this information will rapidly be dated? Assessing the durability of project outcomes in the face of expected climate change is recommended, with reference to STAP guidance on climate risk screening https://www.stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening</p> <p>Other risks include that lack of political will at any level and within any of the involved agencies stymies achievement of the outcomes, that farmers are unwilling to change practices, that commercial crop varieties remain attractive to farmers for economic or social reasons.</p>

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, there is little evidence of learning from other projects reflected in the PIF.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	As above.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	No, not based on what is presented here.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	
	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?	There is much emphasis on knowledge generation and capture of lessons, although with little specificity about modalities or dissemination. There is reference to other projects, though no indication of mechanisms to learn and share lessons.
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 PIF indicates a knowledge management strategy will be developed, but there is little specific about what it will look like. In particular, it would be good to see more clarity about who needs to be provided with what sort of knowledge for what purposes.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	FAO mechanisms will be used to disseminate widely some of the results of this initiative.

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	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:

(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.