

Strengthened Systems for Community-based Conservation of Forests and Peatland Landscapes in Indonesia (CoPLI)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10731

Countries

Indonesia

Project Name

Strengthened Systems for Community-based Conservation of Forests and Peatland
Landscapes in Indonesia (CoPLI)

Agencies

IFAD

Date received by PM

11/7/2022

Review completed by PM

4/5/2023

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 7, 2023 HF:

Comments cleared.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

1.) As this project is at CER stage, project geographies, components, measures etc should have a higher level of certainty than "proposed" or "could." The proposal was approved at PIF stage, and the PPG period is meant for further design and planning for project implementation to get underway after endorsement/inception. Please revise the CER and project documentation accordingly with results of the PPG including concrete plans and language.

2.) Throughout the Outputs (particularly 1 and 2) and corresponding 'institutional arrangements' please provide more specificity regarding the critical Ministries and DGs that will be cooperating/coordinating on this project given the multi-sectoral/stakeholder approach described and the importance of policy coherence to achieving project results. This is also relevant to the "stakeholders" section. It seems that the governmental units should include those who hold the ability to issue various concessions and licenses or make decisions regarding land-uses that could have a negative impact on the integrity of ecosystems in target landscapes (at the local level or national level).

Agency Response

16 February 2023:

1) The CER and project documentation has been revised accordingly to specify the activities that will be undertaken. The design has fully drawn on the result of the work undertaken during the PPG stage.

2) Additional information on central Ministries and DGs that will be cooperating/coordinating on this project have been included in the section on outputs and well as the Stakeholder section and the Stakeholder engagement plan.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 20, 2023 HF:

Comment cleared.

April 12, 2023

There are two sources of co-financing that do not have letters of support. Please provide these letter of support or to remove them and include later during project implementation reporting etc.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

- 1.) Please include the co-financing letters from YIARI and private sector co-financiers.
- 2.) Please ensure all co-finance letters include all required information found in the 2018 [Global Environment Facility Guidelines on Co-financing](#) page 4, #7, including the timeframe.
- 3.) Typically, 'in-kind' co-financing is categorized as 'Recurrent expenditures', and 'grant' as 'Investment mobilized'. Please correct the entries accordingly. At CEO endorsement, only 'confirmed' co-financing can be reported with appropriate evidence (e.g., co-financing letters issued and signed by the original co-financier, board paper) please remove the co-finance that is not confirmed. You can report back in Portal on (new) materialized co-finance at Mid-Term Review and/or Terminal Evaluation.

Agency Response

17 April 2023

Co-funding from private sector and CSOs have been removed from table A, B and C and will be confirmed at the project start up.

16 February 2023

- 1) The co-funding letters from YIARI and the Private sector are under discussion.

It was suggested by the Government, that we need to ensure the project accepted by GEF-Sec and those documents will be completed from YIARI and private sectors during the kick-off project.

- 2) The co-finance letters have been revised to include the timeframe over which the co-funding will be provided for:
 - a) Revision Co-finance letter from IFAD
 - b) Revision Co-finance letter from MoEF

The classification of the co-finance in the Table has been adjusted in line with the guidance provided.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 7, 2023 HF:

Comments cleared

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

- 1.) Unclear. This will somewhat depend on the outcome of the issue regarding Core Indicator 4 target.
- 2.) Both amounts ?the GEF Project Financing and Agency Fee? at CEO Endorsement (\$5,329,000 and \$506,255) are lower than the amounts approved at PIF stage (\$5,329,452 and \$506,298). Please clarify whether there is a justification for this or if it was accidental, please correct.
- 3.) On the PMC: the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 4.9%, for a co-financing of \$20,641,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,011,409 instead of \$201,000 (which is 0.9%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

Agency Response

16 February 2023

- 1) The area of landscapes with enhanced management has been adjusted
- 2) The amounts for GEF project financing and agency fee have been adjusted to be the same as in the PIF
- 3) The allocation of co-finance for PMC have been adjusted to match the same proportion as the GEF PMC.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 20, 2023 HF:

Comment cleared.

April 5, 2023 HF:

Comment 4 on status of utilization of PPG ? still the level of detail is minimum ? please breakdown/itemize the ?consultancy contract? by using the categories included in the GEF Guidelines.

Noting that the GEF PPG grant was \$50,000.

March 7, 2023 HF:

Status of PPG: the expenditure categories were included, but it is unclear how much was spent on which budget item. Also, there is one ineligible category (Administrative cost) + a deficit of UD\$493. Please amend the current format to make it possible to understand the cost of each budget item ? please provide an explanation on how to cover the above-mentioned deficit.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

1.) Please provide further detail regarding the use and allocation of PPG funds in the table in annex C.

Agency Response

23 March 2023

Revised already with new data provided and we spent US\$ 150K in 2021-2022 for the PPG budget. It was synchronized into the CER.

16 February 2023

Further detail on use of PPG has been given in the table in Annex C

17 April 2023

Done - PPG amount granted was \$150,000

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 5, 2023 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 7, 2023 HF:

1.) Noted that there has been a 65% reduction in Core Indicator target for CI 4 from PIF to CER. Please include the explanation and justification for this significant decrease in the text box under the Core Indicator table and 'changes from PIF' section of the CER. Also, please include the corresponding Global Biodiversity Framework target this project will contribute to.

2.) Please upload excel spreadsheet in Portal as requested. Cleared with the understanding that indirect GHG impacts will be calculated at MTR and TE stage with a clarification of the causal chain behind these reduction and of the linkage with improved biodiversity considerations in production landscapes if any.

3.) Cleared.

4.) Cleared.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

1.) The target for Core Indicator 4 at PIF stage was 800,000. The core indicator target has been reduced by 85% to only 125,550 hectares with no explanation of this dramatic reduction provided. This calls into question the return on investment of this \$26 million (\$6m GEFTF/\$20m co-finance) project. Please revise the core indicator target; and provide justification for any deviation from the original target at PIF; and a clear explanation of the composition of the hectare targets under CI-4.

2.) Given the need to revise the Core Indicator 4 target, the GHG target will also need to be commensurately revised. Additionally, when resubmitting, please include excel sheet that contains the GHG accounting for this project for further review.

3.) Please include the Excel sheet and that the links to NEXT resources that would contribute to justify alignment with IPCC 2019.

4.) Please include explanation for the targeted percentage improvements in the METT scores for the PAs.

Agency Response

March 23 2023

1) An explanation for the decrease in the target for indicator CI 4 has been included as a note under the core indicator table and also cross referenced in the section changes from PIF. Reference is made in a note to the indicator table and detailed in Table 11 to the various GBF Targets that the project will contribute to.

2) The excel spreadsheet for calculation of the GHG emissions has been uploaded in the portal Files document provided for [FAO_Peat-GHG-Tool_GEF_COPLI_revPAFP] and [GHG_Area_Revision version 2]

The following note has been included in the CER in Note 3 to the Indicator table: It is further proposed that indirect GHG impacts will be calculated at MTR and TE stage with a clarification of the causal chain behind these reductions and of the linkage with improved biodiversity considerations in production landscapes if any.

16 February 2023

1) Based on detailed examination of the PIF and related documentation, it appears that the figure of 800,000 ha included in the PIF was as a result of inadvertent error as there were never 500,000 ha of production landscapes in the Danau Sentarum landscape. The figure is related to the production area of an earlier proposed site of the southern Ketapang Peatland Landscape in the south of West Kalimantan Province. This site was changed by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) to Danau Sentarum Peatland Landscape shortly before the submission of the PIF and the difference in area of production landscapes was not adjusted. There are only about 11,000 ha of production landscapes (oil palm) plus additional areas of forest management units in the Danau Sentarum Peatland Landscape.

The change from South Ketapang to Danau Sentarum was made because Danau Sentarum is a much more important landscape for biodiversity conservation and was prioritised by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. Although there are limited production areas in the landscape, there is however more than 100,000ha of natural forest within a Forest Management Unit within the landscape. This area has the potential to be logged or converted to production land for rubber, oil palm or tree plantations. The project will work to secure the area for biodiversity conservation.

The project design team has also looked at inclusion of additional area of landscape to be included in eastern Indonesia through development of village land use plans supported by Co-financing. The target for core indicator 4 has been adjusted from an earlier estimate of 125,550ha based mainly on selected direct site-based interventions, primarily with GEF

resources ? to 282,000ha with a combination of direct and indirect measures including some co-financed actions

2) The GHG emission reduction calculated by the project was based on detailed analysis of the direct measures for peatland rewetting, fire prevention, enhanced water management, agroforestry etc, financed through the project. This has now been slightly adjusted upwards, considering additional information from project stakeholders. However, to remain conservative, it remains focussed on direct interventions in the two core project landscapes in West Kalimantan and is not expanded to other areas at the national level or in other provinces supported through policy and capacity development and scaling up action which might lead to indirect GHG emission reductions. It is not possible at this stage to accurately calculate the specific emission reductions from these activities ? but the project will establish a monitoring system to track and report these broader GHG emission reductions.

The adjusted carbon-balance now amounts to **-3,270,431 tCO₂e** over a 20-years period (5 years of implementation and 15 years of capitalization) **for a total surface of 5,000 ha**.

It is deemed inappropriate to calculate GHG emission reductions for the larger landscapes identified in Core indicator 4 where it is planned that biodiversity will be better incorporated into production landscapes through GEF and co-financing ? as a) incorporation of biodiversity considerations does not directly lead to GHG emission reductions; b) there is insufficient information on the current emissions from these landscapes; c) the project is fully financed under the Biodiversity focal area and so interventions and resources are focused primarily on this aspect.

The excel sheets for the revised calculation are Provided

3) The calculations have been made using both FAO's Peatland GHG tool for GHG emission reductions on organic soils and FAO's Nationally Determined Contributions Expert Tool (NEXT) for GHG emissions on mineral soils. Both tools are aligned with IPCC 2019 and IPCC 2013 (wetland supplement) methodologies.

A very detailed explanation for the rationale of the use of both tools is provided in Annex 8. In summary, due to the complexity of peatlands (impact on both the water and carbon cycle), carbon-balance assessments need to be adapted to a more complex methodology (taking into account carbon dioxide, dissolved organic carbon, methane and nitrous oxide emissions).

The link to the Peat-GHG tool guidance can also be found [here\[1\]](#)¹ and the link to the tool itself can be found [here\[2\]](#)².

The link to NEXT can be found [here\[3\]](#)³, while a peer reviewed article can be found [here\[4\]](#)⁴ and a more detailed explanation of its methodology can be found [here\[5\]](#)⁵.

Further information including access to the hidden worksheets can be provided upon request to FAO.

4) Further explanation has been given in Annex A and F of the CER for the targeted percentage improvements in the METT scores for the PAs.

The METT data from both National Parks (Danau Sentarum and Gunung Palung) were formally taken from Ministry of Environment & Forestry (MoEF) internal information. The detailed data are:

- o Danau Senatrum latest data taken in 2019 with the total number is 82
- o Gunung Palung latest data taken in 2021 with total number is 77

The target of the CoPLI is at least to stabilize or even better to increase the number with quality results (not only just number) and if needed to develop corrective-actions for the documents for better management of the national park with the support from the community who stay inside (Indigenous people) and buffer zone area. Priority will be placed on enhancing the management of the peatland ecosystem within the national park as this is not currently emphasised ion the management systems and practices.

[1] <https://www.fao.org/3/cb4570en/cb4570en.pdf>

[2] <http://www.fao.org/3/CB4570EN/CB4570EN.xlsx>

[3] [https://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/ndcs/research-tools/next/en/#:~:text=The%20Nationally%20Determined%20Contribution%20Expert%20Tool%20\(NEXT\)%20is%20a%20greenhouse,land%20use%20\(AFOLU\)%20sector%20.](https://www.fao.org/climate-change/our-work/what-we-do/ndcs/research-tools/next/en/#:~:text=The%20Nationally%20Determined%20Contribution%20Expert%20Tool%20(NEXT)%20is%20a%20greenhouse,land%20use%20(AFOLU)%20sector%20.)

[4] <https://doi.org/10.4060/cc0568en>

[5] <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fclim.2022.906142/full>

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 7, 2023 HF:

Comments cleared.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

1.) The baseline scenario for this project needs updating as many of the citations are dated. Please update with current data, citations and assessment of the baseline in both landscapes. For example this PNAS paper from 2020 (<https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2009240117>) provides strong conclusions and citation of data/publications to inform the baseline. Ground-truthing the baseline is a core element of the PPG process.

2.) Baseline projects seem incomplete (also per comments at PIF). The fifteen years of investment by ASRI (Alam Sehat Lestari: <https://www.alamsehatlestari.org/>) and FFI are critical baseline investment in the conservation and development of the landscapes within and surrounding GPNP. Noting here that both were consulted in as stakeholders at PPG. Please revise project baseline to include all current and ongoing baseline investments and projects on which this new GEF project will build.

Agency Response

16 February 2023

1) Updated baseline data

Additional information has been added to the baseline section drawing on both Government data as well as recent publications

2) Additional information has been added in the table on baseline projects especially to include the ongoing activities of NGOs such as YIARI, YASRI, Yayasan Palung, FFI etc.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

March 7, 2023 HF:

Comments cleared.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

1.) The theory of change includes 'risks' that in fact look like the 'barriers' to addressing drivers of peatland loss. Please clarify, explain and/or revise.

Agency Response

16 February 2023

The selection of the risks included in the TOC diagram and associated text have been adjusted and some have been reworded and moved to the sections on barriers and assumptions. Detailed discussions on risks and mitigation measures are given in the Risk and Mitigation measures section

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 8, 2023 HF:

Comment cleared.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

Once issue of target for Core Indicator 4 is resolved, please revise project GEBs accordingly.

Agency Response

16 February 2023

The GEB section has been significantly revised to include the expanded target for enhancement of biodiversity management in the production landscape. An analysis has been made to identify the contributions of the project to the Global Biodiversity Framework as adopted by CBD COP 15 on 19 December 2022.

The text has also been modified to include the enhanced target for GHG emission mitigation and adaptation.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 8, 2023 HF:

Comment cleared.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

1.) Please further elaborate plans for ensuring the activities supported and results achieved under Outcome 2 will be sustainable past the period of project implementation, particularly related to resource mobilization/budget.

Agency Response

16 February 2023

Text has been added in the sustainability section to specify plans for ensuring the activities supported and results achieved under Outcome 2 will be sustainable

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response
Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
NA

Agency Response
Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
March 8, 2023 HF:
Comments cleared.

Agency should double-check whether the timeline for stakeholder engagement is included in project documentation as it was not obvious in the stakeholder engagement plan/annex nor CER document (per question #2).

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

- 1.) Please clarify how the information gathered during stakeholder consultations, (particularly at the sub-national and local levels), that were undertaken during PPG was used in project design and or eventual implementation? Currently the connection between the stakeholder consultations that have been held and the project design are unclear.
- 2.) Please include a timeframe/plan for stakeholder engagement during project implementation. The stakeholder current engagement plan (as Annexed) seems to be missing the potential timing for the engagement of/with identified stakeholder groups, without which it does not come across as a plan. Please update the CER and annex accordingly.
- 3.) The annex includes: **"3.) Stakeholder Engagement Program 19.) The main purpose of this SEP is to create awareness of the key deliverables of the project, project status - update stakeholders on key activities, and provide avenues for them, especially the**

vulnerable, to voice their concerns and grievances." This seems to have left out (or we missed/misunderstood) the meaningful engagement and participation of stakeholders as full partners in the design and implementation of the project activities to ensure the highest relevance, benefit and sustainability of these activities for project stakeholders. This goes far beyond awareness of deliverables and voicing concerns. Please explain and revise documentation accordingly.

Agency Response

23 March 2023

1) The timeline for stakeholder engagement is included in Section 4.3 in the stakeholder plan on page 289 of the annexes to the PDR as resubmitted. This was inadvertently excluded from the version submitted in February.

2) Mentioned in the PDR section 7.4.1 Stakeholder Engagement and Annex 5. Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

16 February 2023

1) An additional paragraph has been added in the CER to describe information gathered during stakeholder consultations, that were undertaken during PPG was used in project design and or eventual implementation.

2) A timeframe/plan for stakeholder engagement during project implementation has been included in the Stakeholder engagement Plan in Annex 5 of the PDR

3) The stated main purpose of the SEP has been to be adjusted to include to include meaningful engagement as follows:

?The main purpose of this SEP is to ensure the meaningful engagement and participation of stakeholders as full partners in the design and implementation of the project activities to ensure the highest relevance, benefit and sustainability of these activities. It will also help create awareness of the key deliverables of the project, project status and regularly update stakeholders on key activities, and provide avenues for them, especially the vulnerable, to voice their concerns and grievances?.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the

project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 8, 2023 HF:

Comments cleared.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

1.) While a gender assessment plan was prepared and provided as an annex, the key gender perspectives have to be incorporated in the project components, outputs and activities. This is consistent with good gender mainstreaming practice and will better ensure gender-responsive implementation of the project activities. Agency is therefore requested to reflect in the various components of the project specific gender-responsive measures (e.g., women's participation, economic benefits, access to resources, sex-disaggregated data, etc.) it will undertake to comply with GEF's policy and guidance.

Agency Response

16 February 2023

Core elements of the Gender action plan in Annex 3 of the PDR have been incorporated into the component, outputs and activity descriptions in the CER as well as in the M&E section.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 8, 2023 HF:

Comments cleared.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

1.) Please further elaborate how this project plans to engage the private sector in the avoidance and restoration of impacts on these landscapes of private sector activities and mainstreaming of BD conservation into private sector operations.

2.) There are four types of "proposed interventions" for project engagement with the private sector. Despite this it is not clear what exactly these types of interventions are/mechanisms by which the engagement will happen (e.g. for i.) would this be via funding from the community foundations of the firms? or ? and for ii.) is this via support to management

planning for concessions?) given the nature of the private sector listed (e.g. concession holders). Please provide further detail.

Agency Response

16 February 2023

- 1) The section on private sector engagement has been expanded and rewritten to elaborate how this project plans to engage the private sector in the avoidance and restoration of impacts on the targeted landscapes through private sector engagement.
- 2) More details have been included on the exact mechanism of private sector action as requested

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 8, 2023 HF:

Comments cleared.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

- 1.) Given the presidential elections and change in administration during the middle of this project, please include the potential risk posed by this change in leadership and cabinet members, possibly under the first risk 'political commitment'.
- 2.) Section 11 in the CER should include a broad statement of risks, whereas the current text is only focused on climate risk. Please revise.

Agency Response

16 February 2023

- 1) The risk related to the change of President and Ministers in 2024 has been added in the risk table in Section 5 in the political commitment section.
- 2) Section 11 in the CER has been modified to include environment and Social risk as well as climate risks

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 8, 2023 HF:

Cleared. Please include in the CEO ER section the description provided in the review sheet of project contribution with the NDC.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

1.) Please include a description of potential alignment of this project/outputs of this project with Indonesia's new 'enhanced NDC'-while recognizing that the design of this project if focused on BD GEB production but given the target ecosystems significant GHG emission reduction is expected and there may be alignment accordingly.

Agency Response

16 February 2023

Text has been inserted to address alignment with Indonesia's enhanced NDC:

The Project is also in line with the Indonesia's Enhanced Nationally Determined Contribution under the Paris Agreement of UNFCCC which was adopted in September 2022 as well as the Goal for FOLU Net Sink by 2030. It will contribute to the target for improvement of water management in peatland in oil palm plantations in the targeted landscapes as well as reducing

emission from degraded peatland through rewetting and revegetation. It will also support adaptation measures specified in the enhanced NDC including strengthening implementation of landscape approach in social forestry, restoration of peatlands, enhancing conservation education including engaging adat communities for indigenous knowledge and local wisdom.

In its Enhanced Nationally Determined Contribution, Indonesia increased its unconditional emission reduction target of 31.89% against the business as usual scenario by the year of 2030 (2.869 GtCO₂-eq. per year). CoPLI will contribute an average emission reduction of -163,522 tCO₂e./year representing approximately 0.05% Indonesia's annual emission reduction target.

In addition, the project will also be an important contribution for climate change adaptation, notably, the reduction of drivers of vulnerability to climate change impacts, a response to climate change impacts and managing risks, and an enhanced capacity of communities and sustainability of ecosystem services

23 March 2023

- 1) Text on NDC is added into the CER in section 7
- 2) It was written as NDC (Nationally Determined Contribution)

Specifically, the Project will support institutional sustainability through:

- o Linking closely with the implementation and review of the Indonesian national policies and strategies for CBD and UNFCCC;
- o Linking with strategies, investment plans and capacity development related to the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) for emission reductions for 2020-2030 under the Paris Agreement of UNFCCC and updated under FOLU Net Sink 2030;

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 20, 2023 HF:

Comment cleared.

April 5, 2023 HF:

Still the discrepancy persists in Budget Table of M&E (totaling \$224,692) while in the M&E plan it is \$507,000. Please fix this.

March 8, 2023 HF:

M&E figures and budget lines in budget table (annex E in Portal) are quite different than those in M&E Budget Table in section 9 (see below). Please correct.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

1.) In Budget Table M&E totals \$224,692 while in the M&E plan it is \$494,000. Please ask the Agency to fix the discrepancy.

Agency Response

1) As explained earlier the apparent difference between the M&E costs in the budget table in Annex E and the M&E Budget table in section 9 is that the Budget in annex E is the GEF funds while the M&E plan includes both GEF and Government funds. In addition some figures in section 9 were rounded.

To address this the table in section 9 has been modified to have a column for GEF funding and a column for government co-funding. Now the figures for GEF exactly match.

16 February 2023

The figure in the budget in Annex A of the CER is the budget for the use of the GEF funds. The figure in the M&E plan includes the co-funding of the M&E by the GOI. Nevertheless, a slight adjustment has been made to reflect the latest budget total of \$507,000 for the combined M&E with GEF financing of \$224,692.

17 April 2023

Table 12 on page 62 has been amended to reflect correct GEF M&E Plan.

a) A total of USD 224,692 is taken from the GEF fund.

i. Baseline survey US\$ 52,785

ii. M&E Officer US\$ 66,296

iii. Monitoring of GHG emission reduction & biodiversity US\$ 34,439

iv. Mid-Term Review US\$ 20,206

v. Terminal Evaluation US\$ 50,966

b) The total USD 507,000 is combined between the GEF Fund and co-funding from the Government of Indonesia (GoI). The GEF fund will contribute 44% from the total M&E budget and the government 56%.

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

Yes, clearly.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 8, 2023 HF:

Comments cleared.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

1.) The use of GEF resources to purchase vehicles is discouraged per GEF policy and should be covered with co-finance whenever possible. If there are exceptional circumstances to justify such a purchase, please provide clear justification in the budget notes for review.

Agency Response

16 February 2023

The two project landscapes are large and in remote regions of west Kalimantan, spread across three districts. Timely access to transport on a full time basis is essential for the three Local implementing units to operate effectively. The project is focussed on integrated, cross-sectoral management and aims to work with multiple agencies and stakeholders from national, provincial, district and local levels ; from government , private sector and local communities. The landscape-based teams will be hosted by district environment agencies which are relatively small agencies with limited vehicles, budgets and resources. Some of the project areas are in national parks and forest management units under the jurisdiction of national and provincial agencies. With this complex institutional setting ? it is not feasible for the district environment agency to provide all necessary vehicles to the project on a full-time basis. Attempting to borrow vehicles from multiple agencies, would be too complicated and not efficient.

In response to the comment highlighting GEF policy is not to purchase vehicles, and following discussions with the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, it is proposed to adjust the budget to use the allocated resources for rental of vehicles and other means of transport (eg boats). This more flexible and cost effective approach may also be preferable as it will enable transport of both project personnel as well as consultants and other stakeholders such as target community members.

The budget concerned represents only 2% of the GEF resources and less than 0.5% of the overall project resources and so is not considered excessive.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

Cleared

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Cleared

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 8, 2023 HF:

Comments cleared.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

Thank you for responses to the many comments from Council.

1.) Please note that the final IFAD response includes this text: "This section will be further revised before finalization and submission of the CER." It is likely a holdover from the design period. Please further elaborate the response to Canada's comment regarding duplication and remove this remnant text.

Agency Response

16 February 2023

1) The response to Canada's comment has been elaborated and the remnant text has been removed

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Cleared

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 8, 2023 HF:

Comments cleared.

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

1.) Please provide further detail regarding the use and allocation of PPG funds in the table in annex C

Agency Response

16 February 2023

1) Further detail has been given regarding the use and allocation of PPG funds in the table in annex C.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Nov 21, 2022 HF:

Cleared

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 20, 2023 HF:

Yes. All comments cleared and recommended for Council review prior to CEO endorsement. 2nd cancellation date is June 18, 2023, as extended.

April 5, 2023 HF:

No, please address/fix remaining issues, highlighted in yellow in this review sheet.

The 2nd cancellation deadline is fast approaching (June 18, 2023). This project must complete a required 4-week GEF Council review period (as was requested by Council at time of WP approval) prior to endorsement. Please resubmit as soon as possible.

March 8, 2023 HF:

No, not at this time. Please revise relevant project documentation to respond to GEFSEC review comments where noted (including CER in Portal, project document and annexes) and resubmit. Highlighting text changes is helpful to ease re-review. Please note that this project must be circulated to GEF Council for a 4-week review period after GEFSEC PM clearance and prior to CEO endorsement. Cancellation deadline is June 18th and at least 6-7 weeks

must be allocated to facilitate the Council circulation process. therefore we recommend prompt revision and resubmission of this project.

November 21, 2022 HF:

No, not at this time. Please revise all relevant project documentation to respond to GEFSEC review comments (including CER in Portal, project document and annexes) and resubmit. Highlighting text changes is helpful to ease re-review.

Also: Please ensure that when this project is resubmitted that all documents included in the "documents tab" of the Portal are appropriately classified and submitted per GEF guidelines. Currently the project document is marked as "GEFSEC only" but it must be public to facilitate the Council 4-week review. Please review all classifications and submission guidelines to ensure that project documentation shows up in this tab and is accessible.

The current 2nd cancellation deadline for this project is December 18, 2022. To avoid impending cancellation of this project, please submit an extension request letter signed by the OFP to the portal prior to the cancellation deadline.

Finally, this project was flagged by GEF Council to undergo a 4-week Council review period prior to endorsement. Please ensure at least additional 6-7 weeks are included in the extension to allow for this.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	11/21/2022	2/17/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/8/2023	3/27/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/5/2023	4/17/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/20/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

