Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID	**10393**	
Project Title	**Strengthening the integral and sustainable management of biodiversity and forests by indigenous peoples and local communities in fragile ecosystems of the dry forests of the Bolivia Chaco**	
Date of Screening	6-Dec-19	
STAP member Screener	Rosie Cooney	
STAP secretariat screener	Virginia Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment	ß	**Minor issues to be considered during project design.** STAP welcomes this project focused on biodiversity and forest management in the Bolivian Chaco, and generally views it as an exciting and positive initiative based on a comprehensive problem definition and careful targeting of drivers. Its main weakness is very unclear writing and undefined terminology, which makes it difficult at times to determine exactly what is planned. For example, the project hinges on the concept of "Integral Sustainable Management of Biodiversity and Forests", a concept that appears well-entrenched nationally, but this is not defined and described clearly anywhere. Information on the relationship between indigenous-held lands and National Park areas is lacking, making interpretation and understanding of the local governance/tenure context and how the intervention will change this difficult. The project would be strengthened by incorporating a clear and explicit TOC that identifies pathways for change and underlying assumptions.
Part I: Project Information		
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	No, the objective is very long and hard to follow. It uses unclear terms such as "integral management" and "strengthening life systems", and is composed of a long sequence of dependent terms i.e. sustainable mgt of biodiversity/forests FOR sustainable forest management FOR integral planning. (How can sustainable management of forests (along with biodiversity) be a strategy for sustainable management of forests?) The actual objective of all this is unclear. It needs to be stated simply and clearly. It appears to be simply establishing or increasing sustainable forest management and sustainable land management in the Chaco. "Integral" is used throughout but it may be that a better translation is "integrated", as the meaning of integral management is unclear.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	There are some unclear aspects. Are components 1 and 2 referring to activities in the same areas? Component 1 reads as if this is about strengthening management by IPLCs, and in the description there is no reference to PAs, but the indicators for this component (p 15) refer to improvements in management of National Parks. Component 1 is about establishing the basis of governance and planning for ISMBF, which is clear. But component 2 is about implementing ISMBF, but doesn't refer to the plans developed in 1. Presumably component 2 is largely about various structures implementing the plans that they have developed in 1? Making this clearer would be helpful.

Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	These are clear.
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes.
	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?	
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?	Yes, quite well. It is good to see some of the socio-political/economic drivers. A map in this section would be very helpful, given the extensive geographic description. The term ISMBF needs to be clearly defined the first time it is used. It is not clear why, if the impacts are primarily caused by intensive agriculture, why the project is targeting indigenous territories rather than industrial farmers/farming. In this sense the intervention is not clearly linked to the problem statement. For example, if the rationale is that these areas are most critical for remaining biodiversity, or improved management is more possible here, or the co-benefits in terms of cultural integrity and livelihoods are stronger, this should be clearly stated.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	A definition for "territorial planning" is required - does this refer to planning for indigenous territories, or some other territories? Barrier 2 is framed as a lack of capacity, but it appears that addressing this barrier is not just about building capacity, but about changing paradigms, assumptions, and ways of thinking. This has implications for how interventions are designed and implemented, so is worth considering explicitly. Finally, assessing whether integrating ISMBF will address all these barriers depends critically on what ISMBF really consists of, and this is not defined clearly anywhere, so this is very hard to judge.
	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?	There is a very clear case for integrating these two focal areas.
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	No. The baseline description mainly describes government policy/planning instruments, without specifying the level of likely implementation and impact of these.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	No. The baseline description mainly describes government policy/planning instruments, without specifying the level of likely implementation and impact of these.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	

	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, this is quite weak.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	
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 no explicit theory of change, and including a graphic and narrative TOC showing how the pathways of action address the drivers and barriers would be very helpful.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	Again, the lack of definition of ISMBF makes it hard to work out what exactly will change on the ground. Some of the text is very hard to follow e.g. "Hence, OECOMs will contribute the economic sustainability of the OECOMs by acting as their value adding and commercial body of the ISMBF implemented by indigenous peoples". Overall, however, there is a reasonably clear sequence of events to lead to positive biodiversity, SFM and LD outcomes.
	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	The details of component 1 are very hard to understand, particularly regarding land tenure, overlap between National Parks and indigenous territories. The indicators for this section are improvement of National Parks management, but the activities and outputs seem to be largely about strengthening indigenous (co) management and developing territory plans/communty plans. How do these relate? Is it the NPs themselves that are also indigenous territories to be co-managed? Also, it would be helpful to have clear information on how much of the intervention area is indigenous territory, and how much small-scale farmers (or other groups).
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	There is little articulation of underlying assumptions.
	· 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. The baseline description mainly describes government policy/planning instruments, without specifying the level of likely implementation and impact of these.
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?	Yes
	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, and are they measurable?	Yes.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes.
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	Yes.
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Yes.

	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The project activities themselves should increase resilience to climate change.
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?	The strengthening of indigenous life-ways is innovative, along with the co-management arrangements proposed, and the integration of scientific and traditional knowledge.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	Yes, this is reasonably clear and convincing.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		
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?	It is welcome to see the strong engagement of relevant stakeholders, including IPLCs, in consultations to develop this project, and particularly to gain their consent. There is very strong identification and buy-in of stakeholders, with a clear plan for engagement.
	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?	
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	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Yes, and specific activities have been planned to target women and build their capacity and decision-making power.
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	
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	Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?	The risks around "Conflicts arising from competition for the use of the land and other resources" appears to be potentially quite serious, and the mitigation measures provided aren't entirely convincing. It is not clear, in any case, that reaching consensus is an appropriate goal, where protection of indigenous tenure rights to ancestral territories is concerned, for example.
	Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?	

	For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:	
	· 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?	Risks associated with climate change, such as extreme weather and fire, have been considered.
	· 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?	The overall focus of the project involves building resilience to climate change.
	· 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?	Yes, there is a range of relevant projects identified and links articulated for some (but not all).
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	
	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?	
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 is only sketched out vaguely and requires more detail.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	
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 *"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."*	
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.	