

IFC comments upon the STAP review of the KCMi -  
Komodo Collaborative Management Initiative

The STAP reviewer has made many excellent comments, which will certainly be taken into account as we prepare for implementation of this project, although we do not feel that they require any amendment of the project brief as submitted.

We thank the Reviewer for the reference to the Auffenberg publication, and will ensure that it is consulted in development of the species management aspects of the project.

WE recognize the concern of the Reviewer as to anticipated levels of tourism. This has been identified in the project development process and is addressed as a significant risk within the brief. We will be adopting all possible strategies to minimize our risk in this regard.



1 October 2001

**STAP TECHNICAL REVIEW**  
**PROJECT TITLE: KOMODO COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT INITIATIVE,**  
**REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA**

Reviewed by  
Jeffrey A. McNeely

Chief Scientist  
IUCN  
1196 Gland, Switzerland  
e-mail: jam@hq.iucn.org

**KEY ISSUES**

**1. Scientific and technical soundness of the project.**

This project has been developed over several years and is based on a very detailed assessment of the situation on the ground. The lists of species are comprehensive, including some new records of marine species. However, it was surprising that the document contained no reference to the classic book on the Komodo dragon, namely Auffenberg, Walter, 1981. **The Behavioral Ecology of the Komodo Monitor.** University of Florida, Gainesville. 406 pp. This book contains considerable relevant information about the most important species for the project.

The research component of the project is relatively modest, except for the proposed monitoring programme. The project will also need to pay attention to the problem of managing invasive alien species of plants and animals. This is particularly challenging in that the main prey species for the Komodo dragon, such as wild pig, horses, and perhaps even deer, are introduced by humans; and important predators on young Komodo dragons are also introduced by people (cats and dogs).

Regarding technical soundness of the project, the project clearly has been designed by a capable team that has been able to identify well the key issues requiring attention. It is particularly encouraging to see the significant participation of the Nature Conservancy (TNC), a leading manager of conservation lands. Their proposed adaptive management approach has proven effective elsewhere.

**2. Global environmental benefits/drawbacks.**

This project will help conserve the world's largest terrestrial lizard species, which is confined to the project area (plus a small portion of the island of Flores, mostly along the coast, and not within any existing protected areas). The project will also protect significant marine resources, though marine conservation efforts have proven more difficult in Indonesia because of the challenges of patrolling.

### 3. How project fits within GEF goals.

The project fits within Operational Programme 2 (coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems). It is designed to address several of the provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity, particularly in terms of Article 7 (identification and monitoring) and Article 8 (*in situ* conservation). Through involving the private sector, it also addresses Article 10b.

### 4. Regional context.

The project area is in the center of Indonesia, a megadiversity country. While the terrestrial fauna is relatively modest, as is to be expected from an island group of this size, the diversity of fish species is remarkably high at both regional and global levels.

Indonesia's National Strategy for Sustainable Development, published by the State Ministry for Environment in 1997 includes the following priority activities related to protected areas:

- Developing a regional conservation programme to integrate protected area conservation and management activities with regional development, including NGOs and local communities and including traditional protection patterns within the programme.
  - Decentralizing authority and intrusting the local government, communities, and NGOs with greater authority in the management of protected areas.
  - Increasing the scope of participation of communities, local government, and NGOs in the management of protected areas by establishing pilot projects in certain areas.
- The Komodo project would appear to fit very well within these criteria. The decentralization of protected area management remains challenging, but this project will be helpful in showing some useful approaches.

### 5. Replicability of the project.

The project is an ideal opportunity to test the feasibility of the idea of "conservation concessions", where the government is essentially assigning responsibility for a major protected area to a non-governmental entity in return for specified benefits. The project has an extremely high level of support among relevant Indonesian government officials, which may open opportunities for replication elsewhere in Indonesia and indeed elsewhere in the tropics. It is perhaps worth noting that Gunung Leuser National Park, in Sumatra, was an earlier example of a conservation concession, under which the Leuser International Foundation was granted in 1995 a 7-year renewable exclusive conservation concession for nearly 1.8 million hectares, with financing including a European Union grant in the amount of US\$ 40.6 million. Such examples may well indicate ways of moving ahead elsewhere in the world.

### 6. Sustainability of the project.

The project is receiving a substantial investment from TNC which, together with the proposed GEF investment, is designed to enable the park to become self-financing by the end of the project. This depends on a reasonable flow of tourists, which the project document identifies clearly as a risk. Recent events have indicated the volatility of the tourism market, not just for Komodo; but given a modest level of expectation of global stability, Indonesian tourism would appear reasonably likely to prosper if not flourish. In any case, the activities designed under this project will provide the greatest

reasonable probability of improved management of the protected area in the long term. The improved fishing techniques will provide immediately perceivable benefits to the local communities, irrespective of tourism income.

## SECONDARY ISSUES

### 1. Linkages to other focal areas.

This project falls clearly within the Biodiversity Focal Area of the GEF. While climate change may lead to some change in sea level and fire regime, and conceivably even to ocean currents, such impacts are likely to be relatively modest. Healthy coral reefs will continue to sequester carbon, but no estimate of this effect has been made.

### 2. Linkages to other programmes.

In addition to the major related projects mentioned in section 2 of the project rationale, Komodo is a World Heritage Site, declared in 1991. Therefore, the United Nations Foundation Project on World Heritage Sites may also have an interest in this project. The project document could have given more emphasis to the World Heritage status of the project area. Komodo is also a Biosphere Reserve, a factor which also receives inadequate attention. As a Biosphere Reserve, Komodo is linked with UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere Programme, which promotes international scientific cooperation dealing with the interactions between people and the environment in all parts of the world. Biosphere reserves provide for the protection of indigenous genetic resources, plant and animal species, ecosystems, and landscapes of value for the conservation of the world's biological diversity; promote the goals of conservation and sustainable use of resources through close cooperation with local communities and taking full advantage of traditional knowledge, indigenous products and appropriate land management; and provide facilities for research, monitoring, education, and training. Considerable scope for cooperation with UNESCO would seem promising under this project.

The project would also contribute to the so-called "Jakarta Mandate" a programme of work on conservation of marine biodiversity established by the second Conference of Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

### 3. Other beneficial or damaging environmental effects.

The project identifies the levels of tourism that would lead to potentially damaging effects in the protected area. However, such levels of tourism appear unlikely to be attained.

### 4. Degree of involvement of stakeholders in the project.

The project has been very effective in identifying key stakeholders, and specifically in engaging an Indonesian private sector entity as a project partner. Because this entity, P.T. Jaytasha Putrindo Utama, an Indonesian eco-tourism company, has a significant financial interest in the project, it is likely to remain deeply involved. The significant involvement of the local government in this contract is especially important. Many of the local villagers are already involved in tourism and would welcome some order in the industry.


**5. Capacity building aspects.**

The project will use primarily government staff, but given the significant levels of management input under the project, it can reasonably be expected that the skills of the Indonesian staff will be enhanced through the project. To the extent that the trained officers will then be promoted to work elsewhere in Indonesia, the entire protected area system of the country may be enhanced.

**6. Innovativeness of the project.**

As indicated above, this project is an outstanding opportunity to test the innovation of a "conservation concession" under somewhat different conditions than have been attempted elsewhere. The significant investment made by a major international NGO (TNC) and the involvement of a significant private sector entity at the national level, are of major interest as an innovation into the management of biodiversity with global implications. The project has the potential of becoming a demonstration project to be replicated, at least in approach much more widely.

One major challenge remains access for tourists, given the somewhat dubious quality of some of the local boats. But this is a sound project and worthy of GEF support.

  
Signed, Jeffrey A. McNeely  
1 OCTOBER 2001