

# 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: May 04, 2015

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Anthony Stocking  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 6965

**PROJECT DURATION :**

**COUNTRIES :** Indonesia

**PROJECT TITLE:** Strengthening Forest Area Planning and Management in Kalimantan

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Environment and Forestry

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** 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):  
**Minor issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP endorses the objective of this challenging proposal, namely "Maintaining forest areas including the biodiversity and ecosystem functions of Kalimantan's lowland and montane areas from the development of estate crops." It is expected that this initiative will also contribute significantly to the Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) Program "Taking Deforestation out of Commodity Supply Chains". Plantation expansion in Kalimantan alone is projected to contribute 18% (0.12 GtC<sub>yr</sub><sup>-1</sup>) of Indonesia's 2020 CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent emissions. (See Kimberly M. Carlson, Lisa M. Curran, Gregory P. Asner, Alice McDonald Pittman, Simon N. Trigg & J. Marion Adeney 2013. Carbon emissions from forest conversion by Kalimantan oil palm plantations. *Nature Climate Change* 3, 283-287 doi:10.1038/nclimate1702.) The same source for this calculation of emissions stresses that quantifying oil palm's contribution to global carbon budgets requires refined spatial-temporal assessments of land cover converted to plantations. As this project proposal develops it will be essential for its executing agencies not only to use state-of-the-science monitoring techniques (for biodiversity, land cover and other ecosystem functions) but also root detailed design firmly in science and the technical literature. In general, the proposal is weak so far in incorporating social science issues and methods. STAP acknowledges the understandable lack of detail in the proposal at this stage but is worried that the actions as specified are somewhat standard and lacking in innovation. Below STAP notes a number of areas that will need detailed attention as the project proposal progresses.

1. There is an underlying assumption in the project design – an outcome of the first barrier on page 8 of the proposal ("Biodiversity and ecosystem services , and their values are not integrated in policies and practices for forest area and strategic plantations/commodities production planning and management at the national and island level.")- that if the conservation value of forests is demonstrated, then forest exploitation will be moderated. It is an appealing proposition that has regrettably failed time and again, partly because of problems of methodology (and hence difficulty in believing the calculations) and partly because actual value varies widely between stakeholders. STAP has argued consistently that the mainstreaming of biodiversity and ecosystem services into policy for production landscapes is far more challenging than merely showing how valuable indigenous forests may be. (See C. Peterson and B. Huntley 2005. *Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes*. Working Paper 20, Global Environment Facility, Washington DC - <http://www.stapgef.org/stap/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Mainstreaming-Biodiversity-a-GEF-working-paper.pdf> ; B.Huntley and K.H. Redford 2014. *Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Practice: a STAP advisory document*. Global Environment Facility, Washington DC - <http://www.stapgef.org/stap/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Mainstreaming-Biodiversity-LowRes.pdf>)

2. Across all three components community engagement appears to be granted a second place after top-down policy, planning and technical input. Yet, communities will need to have significant, if not central, involvement in forest safeguarding plans (Component 1); integrated forest landscape management (Component 2); establishment of new mechanisms for incentive payments (Component 3). It will be insufficient merely to “consult” local leaders. Therefore, while Output 2.2 does promise improved capacity of communities to participate in decision-making for land allocation, forest plantations, palm oil estate design and management, this is about allowing communities to join in the technical processes and new consultation mechanisms rather than harnessing already-accepted and acceptable local institutional mechanisms. STAP strongly urges an enhanced participatory role for communities as the guardians of the forest, through mechanisms such as hukum adat or customary law. So, for example, Component 3 targets financial incentives, which is understandable, but neglects the role of community-prescribed actions or penalties for damage to the environment. In a commentary on the provisions for communities under the Forest Law of 1999, C. Bennett notes that, “the key to a positive outcome is for adat or long established institutions to gain their legitimacy from below and from above, and allow the local community to decide which of its adat institutions should be formally recognized”. (See Recent Legislative Amendments and the Status of Adat “ in Social, Environmental and Legal Dimensions of Adat as an Instrument of Conservation in East Kalimantan. [http://press.anu.edu.au/apem/borneo/mobile\\_devices/ch08s04.html](http://press.anu.edu.au/apem/borneo/mobile_devices/ch08s04.html)) Part of the current project will need to be assigned to building the legitimacy of local institutions from the standpoint of both local and national government.

3. The project rightfully mentions multi-functional landscapes and integrated land management. However, there is currently a vacuum between healthy ecosystem service provision in complex landscapes and the strategies and plans that will be needed to deliver them. In practical terms land allocation will be important, notwithstanding the state as being the legitimate owner. A recent paper based upon the Kalimantan experience, identifies the importance of understanding land allocation in terms of “land sparing” and “land sharing” strategies, and how these contrasting strategies aimed at improving both agricultural production and biodiversity conservation in multifunctional landscapes may achieve divergent outcomes. (See Elizabeth A. Law, Erik Meijaard, Brett A. Bryan, Thilak Mallawaarachchi, Lian Pin Koh, Kerrie A. Wilson. 2015. Better land-use allocation outperforms land sparing and land sharing approaches to conservation in Central Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Biological Conservation* 186: 276-286. ) The authors of this study found that prospective land-use plans for the region would deliver considerably more benefit than the current land-use allocations, and that additional progress could be made with reasonable and realistic levels of land sharing or sparing. Such findings need to be factored into the present proposal, even though the concepts are sometimes difficult to grasp especially by biophysical scientists and central planners.

4. STAP is pleased to see some mention of gender in the proposal to date, although this remains at a rather simplistic level of ensuring that both men and women are consulted. Oil palm and forests, especially in Indonesia, have raised substantial concerns on local society and economy, including the gender dimensions. (See Marcel Gatto, Meike Wollni, Matin Qaim. 2015. Oil palm boom and land-use dynamics in Indonesia: The role of policies and socioeconomic factors. *Land Use Policy* 46: 292-303.) Since smallholder and private palm oil production still predominates, the present project needs to have a clear understanding of both gendered roles in the different production and conservation areas of Kalimantan landscapes. STAP suggests that this be an important part of the PPG work that will feature in the full proposal.

<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>	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.

	<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>
<p><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<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 full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>