

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

Basic Information

GEF ID

10731

Countries

Indonesia

Project Title

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

GEF Agency(ies)

IFAD

Agency ID

IFAD: 2000003596

GEF Focal Area(s)

Biodiversity

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 27, 2021 HF:
Comment cleared.

April 25, 2021 HF:
Please revise the project title in the Portal as it is different than title in the LOE. Please ensure the project title in the Portal matches the title in the LOE.

April 11, 2021 HF:
Comments cleared.

November 20, 2020 HF:
1.) Table A: Please eliminate resource attribution to entry point: BD 1-5 as "Inclusive Conservation" is a separate GEF-7 initiative for which this project would not be a part.
2.) Please reallocate the funds that were tagged to BD 1-5 to the other two entry-points to track the weighting of the project components.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

1 & 2) Noted, in Table A USD 1.8 mil under BD-1-5 (Inclusive conservation) have been reallocated to BD-1-1 (mainstreaming biodiversity) and BD-2-7 (protected areas).

Table 1 in section iv) *Alignment with GEF focal areas* has also been revised accordingly.

27 April 2021

Project title revised to reflect the same title as the LoE.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 11, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

November 20, 2020 HF:

1.) Given the broad nature of the project components and outcomes as well as the previous and ongoing investments in this sectoral and geographic area it is not entirely clear whether they will achieve the project objectives and core indicators. Please increase the focus and specificity of the project's components, outcomes and outputs.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

1) In terms of geographical area, West Kalimantan has been selected as project province upon close consultation with MOEF. This has now been reflected in the project objective and in the more detailed description of the project outcomes and outputs. However, the Project will also support upscaling of community-based conservation of forest and peatlands to other provinces (Output 2.4), which will be facilitated by the TEKAD project. In order to increase the focus and specificity of project components, outcomes and outputs, outcome-level and output-level indicators have been added accordingly in Table B to add more clarity on what indicators to be achieved.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

November 20, 2020 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

Thank you

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion November 20, 2020 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

Thank you

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion November 20, 2020 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

Thank you

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion November 20, 2020 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

Thank you

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Agency response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion November 20, 2020 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

Thank you

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion December 4, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

Thank you

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion December 4, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

Thank you

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 11, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

December 4, 2020 HF:

1.) This section should better address the global environmental (in this case biodiversity) problem(s) the project is aiming to address, including an examination of the drivers of biodiversity loss in the target peatlands. The current description focuses heavily on the institutional and capacity barriers without giving due attention to the critical drivers that this project is aiming to influence to achieve the project outcomes. This description should provide a basis on which to justify GEF financing and lay the foundation for a strong situation model and Theory Of Change development.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

1) Noted, section 1.a.i) on *Global Environmental problems* has been revised to include description of key drivers of habitat (forest and peatlands) degradation and fragmentation which contribute to biodiversity loss. In addition, detailed descriptions of biodiversity of global significance, biodiversity loss, threats and drivers specific to the targeted areas have been added to section 1.a.iii) under *Project location and sites*, and Annex 2 *Description of Proposed Protected Areas in West Kalimantan Province for Selection as Project Landscapes*.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 11, 2021 HF:

Comments cleared.

November 20, 2020 HF:

1.) There is significant baseline investment in the target landscapes in biodiversity conservation but the PIF does not adequately document this and build on it. For example in the Gunung Palung NP area there has been a host of past and ongoing conservation efforts that will be key foundational efforts that this project should build on and compliment. Table 1 states that "there are limited ongoing conservation actions other than limited efforts by CSOs...[...]" whereas there are multiple groups, including national and international NGOs, researchers and government efforts ongoing, including: Fauna and Flora International (FFI)'s long-running efforts, USAID's IFACS, ASRI/Health In Harmony (significant investment, community-based engagement and research in GPNP and surrounding area), Yayasan Gunung Palung etc.

The project target areas have a long-history of international and national investments in biodiversity and forest conservation through a variety of groups, projects and donors. This should be reflected in this baseline section to assist in understanding the baseline scenario and provide a foundation for what the GEF increment would be. Further, this is an opportunity to demonstrate that project proponents have a reasonable level of aware and engagement in the context, conditions and players at the proposed sites. This is not yet apparent.

3.) Please include a description of the baseline scenario in this section.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

1 & 2) Noted, further details on relevant initiatives and actors, which the project will build on in the targeted project area, have been added to section 1.a.ii) *Baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects*, as well as in section 6 *Coordination*, with Table 6 *Other On-going Activities in the Project Area*, listing these initiatives. These include but are not limited to the project mentioned here i.e. FFI KCCP, USAID IFACS, ASRI/Health In Harmony, Yayasan Gunung Palung etc. More details on the IFAD TEKAD project (co-financing the GEF7) have been added in Annex 5 *Profile of TEKAD Project*.

In Table 1, the sentence stating that "there are limited ongoing conservation actions other than limited efforts by CSOs...[...]" has been removed, as it referred mainly to the targeted site of Muara Kendawangan Nature Reserve, which has now been replaced by Danau Sentarum National Park (DSNP). This change of one of the targeted NP follows recommendation from MOEF, and is related to the fact that DSNP has much larger pristine peatland areas, based on latest mapping and assessments by MOEF, and is therefore more suitable for the Project. Gunung Palung National Park (GPNP) remains as target area in addition to DSNP. Section 1.b) was updated accordingly.

3) Noted, a description of the baseline scenario has been added in section 1.a.ii) *Baseline scenario and associated baseline projects*.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 22, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared. Great revision. Very clear. Thank you.

April 20, 2021 HF:

1.) The alternative scenario/desired end state of this project has been re-articulated in terms of target species, whereas the project components and objective are focused on a much more holistic, and ecosystem-based view of peatland conservation and management. Clearly indicator species are an important biodiversity focal interests and indicators of conservation effectiveness, but a species-focused alternative scenario seems incomplete/disjointed and a bit confusing and may need to be rethought/redrafted to provide a fuller picture of the desired end state from this investment per the conceptual model and corresponding TOC. Please revise or explain.

2.) Comment cleared.

April 11, 2021 HF:

1.) Please include a simple statement of the alternative scenario of this project (e.g. What is the transformed state/end state that the project seeks to create?) in this section. Still not clear.

2-4) Comments cleared.

5.) Much improved, though would like to see the envisioned scaled-up impacts/intentions of this project (e.g. beyond West Kalimantan) incorporated into this goal/objective statement. Please revise accordingly.

December 4, 2020 HF:

1.) Please include an overview description of the proposed alternative scenario which should depart from the baseline scenario previously described and clearly articulate the proposed alternative through this project. The current overview paragraph is a paraphrase of included activities, which is fine, but doesn't describe the alternative scenario.

2.) The description of program components, and outputs are quite general/generic, even for PIF stage. It almost reads like the project could be proposed for nearly any place based on a formula, rather than a proposed set of components and outputs that are relevant and impactful given the current and local context (like Output 3.3-what is this? at what level? why needed?). In order to have a better sense of what is actually proposed under this project please provide an alternative scenario with outcomes and components that provides a better idea of what is proposed (and why) given the actual needs and priorities both at the national level and provincial/local level.

3.) Please provide a basic narrative description of the Theory Of Change (TOC) for this project.

4.) Very helpful that the theory of change diagram includes the project assumptions, underlying drivers etc, but unfortunately it doesn't really meet the spirit of a theory of change with clear impact or causal pathways and clear biodiversity focal interest/impact that the project will ultimately target. Please reference the STAP theory of change primer [Theory of Change Primer | Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel \(STAP\) \(stapgef.org\)](#) and USAID's [How-To Guides for USAID Biodiversity Programming – Biodiversity Conservation Gateway \(rmportal.net\)](#) which may provide a better sense of how to integrate these elements into a revised project theory of change.

5.) The project goal in the TOC diagram seems like a re-articulation of the long-term outcomes of the project, rather than the goal itself, which should presumably be the conservation of globally significant peatland forest biodiversity, correct?

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

1) An overview of the proposed alternative scenario has been included in the Theory of Change narrative under section 1.a.iii).

2) A detailed description under each outcome and output (including output on M&E, previously output 3.3) have been added in section 1.a.iii) *Proposed alternative scenario*, and proposed activities have been made more site and context specific.

Component 3 has become the KM and M&E component and previous output 3.1 on Investment Framework has been moved to Output 1.4, as it feeds into outcome 1 strengthening the enabling environment (i.e. policy, regulatory and financial frameworks).

3) A Theory of Change narrative has been added as a chapeau paragraph to section 1.a.iii).

4) The TOC diagram has been removed and will be further developed at PPG stage, following the guidance provided.

5) The project goal has been revised as follow:

To conserve globally important biodiversity and enhance livelihoods in West Kalimantan through a strengthened institutional framework and community-based conservation of peatland ecosystems.

20 April 21

1) A paragraph on the alternative scenario or the envisioned end state that the project seeks to create has been included in in Section 1. a. iii).

2-4) Thank you.

5) The project goal has been revised as follow based on recommendation from MOEF: *To conserve globally important biodiversity and enhance livelihoods through a strengthened institutional framework and community-based conservation of peatland ecosystems.*

April 22, 2021 IFAD:

1) The alternative scenario has been revised accordingly, which now reflects on the holistic, participatory, ecosystem-based approach to be used by the project to address unsustainable peatland management practices, habitat destruction and biodiversity loss. Through these approaches, peatland landscapes will be sustainably managed, ecosystem services maintained, critical population of high-value species more effectively managed, threats to habitat reduced and local affected communities incentivized to protect forests and peatlands through increased flow of income from diversified and biodiversity-friendly livelihoods.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 11, 2021 HF:

Comments cleared.

November 20, 2020 HF:

1.) Per previous comment on Table A entry point attribution above, please eliminate text on BD 1-5 on Inclusive Conservation from the table under section iv.) of the CER.

2.) Given this project is 100% funded with GEF BD Focal Area resources it would make sense to put greater emphasis on BD 1-1 (and/or 2-7) and increase efforts to mainstream biodiversity conservation into peatlands conservation in Indonesia. The project is starting to get

there (from the initial draft concept) but it needs to continue in this direction to ensure solid globally significant biodiversity benefits (as distinct from land or forest management approaches).

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

- 1) Table 1 in section iv) *Alignment with GEF focal areas* has also been revised, in line with revisions made in Table A i.e. to eliminate BD-1-5 focal area.
- 2) Greater emphasis has been put on BD 1-1 (and/or 2-7) and mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into peatlands conservation in Indonesia throughout the document, including in the description of the component and outputs under section 1.a.iii) on *Proposed alternative scenario*.

5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 11, 2021 HF:
Comments cleared.

December 4, 2020 HF:

- 1.) Although this section provides a good basis for understanding the incremental cost reasoning of the project, please clearly state the GEF increment here in one (or two) overview sentences (is it the biodiversity mainstreaming into peatland forest management and multi-stakeholder approach to stitch together the conservation-livelihoods pieces of the puzzle)?
- 2.) The potential complementarity of this project with the TEKAD is very compelling. Please further explain why this project would be investing in livelihood diversification when it seems like the TEKAD project is taking an integrated approach to village economic transformation (and presumably livelihood diversification), whereas the GEF financing could focus on the biodiversity mainstreaming and PA pieces. Please explain further how these two projects are envisioned to be complimentary (particularly when it comes to livelihoods).

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

1) A description of the GEF increment have been added in section v) *Incremental/Additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline* accordingly.

2) The potential complementarities between the GEF7 and TEKAD have been further described in Annex 5 *Profile of TEKAD Project*. Of important note, as mentioned in this Annex, the GEF increment will ensure that the sustainable livelihood development and diversification that will be undertaken through TEKAD in Eastern Indonesia, especially on and adjacent to peatland areas, will incorporate biodiversity considerations into planning at village level when it comes to the type of: (i) livelihoods selected; (ii) sustainable agri-business models developed; (iii) modalities of community engagement; and (iv) capacity building activities adopted - all of which ultimately supporting conservation of peatland biodiversity.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 20, 2021 HF:
All comments cleared.

April 11, 2021 HF:

1.) Comment cleared.

2.) Please include the entirety of the target protected areas, not just a portion of as the project will be investing in improving PA management beyond specific hectares.

3.) Comment cleared. Yes, please elaborate in full monitoring plan to be submitted at CER.

4-5.) Comments cleared. Please see request for CER submission below regarding GHG calculation period.

November 20, 2020 HF:

1.) Please provide justification for the cost per hectare of this project and an explanation of how the target was set for Indicators 1 and 4.

2.) The current target seems low given the proposed activities. One would expect that Land Use Planning efforts at a village and sub-district level alone should generate higher estimates than these. Please increase targets accordingly and/or explain/justify what is being proposed.

3.) Please provide a description of how the biodiversity outcomes/impacts of this project will be measured and monitored.

4.) On a related note, the GHG indicator target seems low relative to the investment for any forest conservation project, but especially on targeting Peatlands.

5.) Thank you for including the GHG calculations with this concept. Please submit plan to submit a completed FAO EX-ACT calculation at CER.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

1) A note has been added under Table F to specify how the target was set for indicators 1 and 4. The cost per ha will be further elaborated in the detailed design process when the full scope of the project interventions is elaborated including an assessment of the co-financed actions.

2) The Target under Indicator 1 has been refined to cover the specific targeted portions of the two protected areas under indicator 1.2. The unspecified area of new protected area to be established has been removed at this stage pending confirmation during detailed design of the feasibility of expanding the existing protected areas or adding additional protected areas (such as community protected areas or areas designated by the government as protection zones outside of formal protected areas (e.g. "Essential Ecosystem Areas (KEE) under Indonesian regulations). The target under Indicator 4.1 has been refined and increased to clarify the specific areas of key habitat targeted for protection in a larger production landscape. These figures will be further refined at the detailed design stage.

3) A Paragraph has been added below Table F to give information on the baseline measurement and subsequent monitoring of the biodiversity in the targeted areas.

4) The target for core indicator 6 on GHG emissions has been increased to 2,902,000 tCO₂ through increase of the estimated area for emission reduction from fire prevention and avoided forest conversion. See revised Annex 6. The figures given are still conservative as they only include the direct emission reductions during the project period. These numbers will be modified further during the detailed design process.

5) At this stage, it has been decided not to use the FAO EX ACT tool as the current tool (based on previous IFAD-GEF project development) is not considered sufficiently accurate for detailed assessment of emission reductions linked to targeted management measures for peatland forest ecosystems in Indonesia. As FAO is currently working on enhancing the tool, to include its application for peatlands, the design team will check at PPG stage if the enhanced EX ACT is available, and if so will use it for the GHG calculation. A paragraph has been added to the Annex 6 in this regard.

20 April 21

1) Thank you.

2) We would like to clarify that the target under Core Indicator 1 has covered the entirety of the targeted two protected areas under indicator 1.2, not just a portion. The amount specified is 235,000 ha, which consists of the totality of the 127,000 ha of Danau Sentarum National Park (DSEN) and 108,000 ha of the Cangkajene Galesong National Park (CGNS).

(USNP) and 108,000 ha from Gunung Palung National Park (GPNP).

3) Thank you, we will make sure to elaborate on how the biodiversity outcomes/impacts of this project will be measured and monitored, in a full monitoring plan to be developed in the CER.

4-5) Thank you, we will make sure to forecast expected GHG emission reductions over a 20 years period in the CER.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 12, 2021 HF:

All comments cleared.

December 5, 2020 HF:

- 1.) **Innovation:** It seems there have been many years of experience in multi-stakeholder approaches to landscape conservation and management in Indonesia-including in West and Central Kalimantan. Some of these attempts less-than successful. Please include an idea for how this project design intends to incorporate lessons learned from ongoing and past efforts and whether/how the project will adapt/innovate to improve on the approach. In addition, during PPG, please consider lessons learned during PPG and in the project design process and include in the CER.
- 2.) Please describe how the PHU used for planning and management overlays with biodiversity values of these forests.
- 3.) **Sustainability:** Given the solid baseline of donor investments in forest peatland management and conservation, and the recent national ban on peatland deforestation referred to, please describe the level of political will (at national, provincial and local level) as well as any local/national investment that will be needed to make the impacts of this (4th generation) of GEF project in peatland forest conservation sustainable. This is particularly important given issues with illegal concessions/licensing that is ongoing and lack of enforcement.
- 4.) Given this is the 4th generation of GEF investment in peatlands in Indonesia, please include a well developed approach to sustainability (perpetuation of impact post-project period) (that is clearly dependent on some of the institutional sustainability elements listed) that is fully articulated.
- 5.) The scale of the GEF and co-finance for this investment seems very modest when compared to both the scale of the problem, and the potential global environmental, and national benefits of succeeding in conserving and protecting peatland forests and their biodiversity in Indonesia. Please include in the PIF some context for what is needed at the larger scale to conserve and protect these ecosystems over the long term (both financially, and institutionally), and how a modest \$6 million GEF project fits into this. This is relevant from a sustainability perspective-as well as in the GEF incremental reasoning-so please address where it fits best. Thank you.
- 6.) Please describe this project's potential for and approach to **scaling-up**.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

- 1) Section on Innovation under 1.a.vii) has been revised to include the incorporation of lessons learned from ongoing and past multi-stakeholders approaches to landscape conservation and management. The design of the Project, as well as its implementation, will be informed by impact assessments, lessons learned and experiences from completed projects and ongoing projects, as described in Annex 3.
- 2) A description of how the Peatland Hydrological Unit (PHU) approach used for planning and management incorporates all environment characteristics, including biodiversity, has been included in section 1.a.vii).
- 3) Section on Sustainability under 1.a.vii) has been revised accordingly.
- 4) More details have been added on the sustainability approach considering 4 generation project in section 1.a.vii).
- 5) Narrative on the costs, and investment framework has been added in Financial Sustainability section 1.a.vii).
- 6) The scaling-up approach through TEKAD has been added in section 1.a.vii), with more details available under Annex 5.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 27, 2021 HF:
Comment cleared.

April 25, 2021 HF:
Please include the map and coordinates in Annex A. The previous request to remove was erroneous.

April 11, 2021 HF:
Comments cleared.

December 5, 2020 HF:

1) Yes. Thank you. At CEP please submit maps and coordinates for all project sites.

1.) Yes. Thank you. At CER please submit maps and coordinates for all project sites.

2.) Please eliminate redundancy please remove Annex A if the map and coordinates are going to be included in the body of the PIF under section 1b.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

1) Well noted and thank you. Section 1.b) has been revised to reflect the updated target areas which now includes Danau Sentarum National Park (DSNP), as mentioned above, and Table 3 on total areas and PHUs targeted has been added.

2) Annex A has been removed from the GEF Portal.

27 April 2021

Map and coordinates are upload in Annex A.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 20, 2021 HF:
Comment cleared.

April 11, 2021 HF:

1.) Please whether, and what stakeholder consultations have been done at the project site (including project affected people and IPLCs in the project target areas) in the design of this project. And if there haven't been consultations to date, please provide an explanation/justification and how it will be compensated for. The current information/revisions to the PIF is still quite vague.

December 5, 2020 HF:

1.) Please whether, and what stakeholder consultations have been done at the project site (including project affected people and IPLCs in the project target areas) in the design of this project. And if there haven't been consultations to date, please provide an explanation/justification and how it will be compensated for. The current information/revisions to the PIF is still quite vague.

1.) Please describe the stakeholder engagement in project identification to date (both at local and national levels)-in particular since this project will have a different focus than previous peatland investments.

2.) Please include further details/identification of specific stakeholder, the respective roles and means of engagement for stakeholders in the project.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

1) A description of the stakeholder engagement in project identification to date has been added in Section 2. *Stakeholders*.

2) Description of the roles, mandates and means of engagement of stakeholders has been added in Section 2. *Stakeholders*, Table 4 *Key Stakeholder Groups*, and Annex 8 *List of Stakeholders, Roles and Mandates*

20 April 21:

1) Preparation of the PIF has not benefitted from a meaningful stakeholder consultation with Project Affected People and Indigenous Peoples in the project target areas because of strict restrictions of movement resulting from COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia. During preparation of the full proposal, the Project will prepare a Stakeholder Engagement Plan to be implemented throughout the project cycle and undertake full and meaningful consultations and stakeholder participation for all the Project components. Section 2. Stakeholders has been revised accordingly to reflect how it will be compensated for.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 20, 2021 HF:
Comment cleared.

April 11, 2021 HF:

1) The

1.) This comment was not sufficiently addressed. Please include information on key gender issues related to the project context (biodiversity/peatland conservation/forestry) and components (e.g. relevant laws, current dynamics/context, cultural norms and traditions shaping behaviors and disaggregated information on target beneficiaries). Please revise.

December 5, 2020 HF:

1.) Please further develop the section on gender which should include more specific information (rather than this generic statement) on gender equality and women's empowerment both within the forest and biodiversity conservation in Indonesia and in the proposed site geographies.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

Project will actively promote the participation of women in training and livelihoods activities. Of important note, the community-based and sustainable diversified livelihood models and the empowerment and capacity building of communities to conserve forest and peatland biodiversity will ensure that at least 40% of the beneficiaries are women, which has been reflected in the second outcome indicator under Component 2. Under Component 3, the Project will also ensure that the knowledge exchange and awareness raising activities will benefit women for at least 40% of the target beneficiaries, as reflected in the proposed second indicator under Component 3 (see Table B. *Project Components and Financing*). As per Section 3, the Project will use the *Gender Equality and Social Inclusion* (GESI) strategy, community participatory approach in planning income generating activities (i.e. diversified livelihoods), and promote participation of women in the decision making process related to project activities. Gender analysis will be undertaken and a Gender Action Plan to be prepared during the detailed design.

20 April 21

Section 3 on *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment* has been strengthened accordingly to include more specific information and examples of gender inequality issues within forest and peatlands in West Kalimantan, highlight one good example of gender empowerment from the government programme that is relevant to the project, and describe potential areas that the project can contribute in addressing gender inequalities and promote gender empowerment.

Gender disaggregated target beneficiaries are available in Table F, with 40% of beneficiaries expected to be women (estimated at 8,000 women smallholders). Gender disaggregated outcome level indicators are available in table B, including:

(i) Outcome 2: At least 20,000 smallholders directly benefitting from improved capacity on biodiversity-friendly on-farm and off-farm livelihoods through training/ demonstration plots (with at least 40% women beneficiaries; and at least 25% beneficiaries are Covid19 affected/vulnerable populations).

(ii) Outcome 3: Level of awareness of communities on peatland and forest biodiversity conservation increased in the target landscapes (at least 60% of samples population aware of conservation threats, and biodiversity-friendly interventions, good conservation practices, etc. in the landscapes, 40% women)

The following output indicator has been revised as:

(i) At least 5 targeted gender sensitive media products (e.g. tutorial videos, printed products in local language) disseminated and knowledge shared through community-level awareness raising events.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 12, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

December 5, 2020 HF:

1.) Given the critical role that companies (and entire industries) play in the future of peatland forests and biodiversity in Indonesia, and in this project, please provide a more complete treatment of private sector engagement in this project. Including the role of this project in shifting supply chains to be biodiversity positive, or at least neutral in peatlands. This should also be complimentary to the ongoing work of the GEF in Indonesia through the GEF-7 Good Growth Partnership and the new GEF-7 Food, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) impact program (among many others).

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

1) Section 4 has been strengthened accordingly, and Table 5 has been added, listing all private sector companies adjacent to the proposed locations of the Project.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 12, 2021 HF:
Comments cleared.

December 5, 2020 HF:

- 1.) Please enhance the description of mitigation measures for several of the risks including 'weak enforcement'
- 2.) Please include corruption either as a risk or incorporated into one of the other project risks.
- 3.) Please further develop the COVID-19 risks/opportunities examination and integrate consideration for COVID-19, where appropriate, in the concept itself.
- 4.) Please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening (link below) and provide at least a basic climate risk screening at PIF stage. At a minimum, at PIF stage, the climate risks should be identified, listed and described. This can include:
 - a.) Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location (or as close to it with data available), which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc).
 - b.) Time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050). Please refer to list of examples from STAP guidance.
 - c.) Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above (describe how the climate scenarios identified above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050).
 - d.) Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and mitigation measures during PPG.

(<https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>)

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

1, 2 and 3) Section 5 has been revised accordingly, including enhanced description of the mitigation measures under weak enforcement, corruption, and COVID-19 impacts. COVID-19 consideration has been also integrated in the narrative under component 2.

4) A paragraph has been added in Section 5 on the preliminary climate risk screening, which is based on Annex 7. *Climate Change Predictions Profile*. This Annex includes a table highlighting the changes in temperatures, rainfall and sea level rise in Indonesia. The Risks Table under Section 5 has included a number of potential mitigation measures related to climate change risks. This will further be detailed during the full design stage

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 12, 2021 HF:

All comments cleared.

December 4, 2020 HF:

- 1.) It seems as though the Ministry of Agriculture should be a key partner in this project for a number of reasons (including the role of oil palm in the target landscapes, and as a driver of forest loss). With out their participation and support it is hard to see how project impacts could be fully achieved and sustainable.
- 2.) Please include a description of where the biodiversity conservation capacity and management responsibility lies in this institutional arrangement given the importance of this to mainstreaming and achievement of project outcomes.
- 3.) Please see previous comments in the baseline section, but there seem to be many relevant projects missing here (USAID's IFACS and Lestari, FFI's work, ASRI/Health In Harmony, Yayasan Gunung Palung etc) that need to be consulted and coordinated with.
- 4.) Please move the table on previous GEF Peatlands projects to this section of the concept.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

1) MoA is already one of the proposed key partners of the project together with, Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration (MoV), and National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS), which will collaborate closely with the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MOEF). The mandates, roles and means of engagement of each stakeholder have been added in Annex 8. *List of Stakeholders and Mandates*, justifying why MOEF is the proposed EA, with MoV and MoA as key partners.

2) Biodiversity conservation capacity and management responsibilities will lie with DG of Natural Resources and Ecosystem Conservation, MOEF as per their mandate, but in the context of this project it will be supported by the DG of Pollution and Environment Degradation Control, notably for conservation efforts on peatland areas within and outside of the two targeted conservation areas. Description has been included accordingly in section 6, as well as in section 2 and Annex 8.

3) Table 6 on *Other On-going Activities in the Project Area* under Section 6 has been revised accordingly and relevant projects in the target area have been added, including USAID's Indonesia Forest and Climate Support (IFACS), ASRI/Health in Harmony, FFI's Ketapang Community Carbon Pools (KCCP), and Gunung Palung Orangutan Conservation Programme (currently Yayasan Palung).

4) Table with the comparison between GEF 4, 5, 6, and proposed GEF7 projects, has been moved to Annex 3.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

December 5, 2020 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

Thank you. Detailed description of the regulations relevant to the sustainable management of peat swamps and forests has been added as

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 12, 2021 HF:
Comment cleared.

December 4, 2020 HF:

1.) Given this will be a '4th generation' GEF-supported peatlands project in Indonesia, please include somewhere in the project justification or as an annex to the PIF, an analysis of the main evaluation findings, or lessons learned from these projects and how they will be incorporated into the design of this project.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

Annex 4 on main findings and lessons learned from 1st and 2nd generation projects GEF4 APFP, GEF5 SMPEI, and IFAD grant HFSLP, has been included. In addition, 3rd generation projects GEF6 IMPLI and GEF6 SMPPEM have just started in 2020 and will also provide lessons in 2021, which will inform the GEF 7 CER design.

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/PI /03?

with requirements set out in SD/PL/03:

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 12, 2021 HF:
Comments cleared.

December 5, 2020 HF:

- 1.) This section is different from the previous "risks" section which deals with risks to the project. This section should address the potential environmental and social impacts of this project and potential mitigation measures/factors/relevant safeguards. Please revise (as it currently seems to mix these two elements in a confusing way).
- 2.) In addition, please include any initial environmental and social safeguard (ESS) pre-screening or relevant safeguard frameworks etc that will be applied to this project (can attach in documents tab).

Agency Response

April 6, 2021:

1 & 2) Section 9 on environmental and social safeguard (ESS) has been added accordingly and initial ESS pre-screening has been added as Annex 9.

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

December 5, 2020 HF:

Yes

Agency Response April 6, 2021:

Thank you

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 27, 2021 HF:

Yes. All comments sufficiently addressed.

April 25, 2021 HF:

Please address two remaining highlighted comments on 1.) Project title in Portal; and 2.) Annex A Map/coordinates.

April 22, 2021 HF:

April 22, 2021 HF:

Yes. This PIF is PM technically cleared. All comments sufficiently addressed.

April 20, 2021 HF:

No. Please address remaining comment on alternative scenario. Highlighted in yellow. Please revise and resubmit as soon as possible but no later than Thursday the 22nd, and preferably Wednesday the 21st.

April 12, 2021 HF:

No. Please address remaining issues and resubmit.

December 5, 2020 HF:

No, not at this time. Please address technical comments in review sheet and resubmit.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 12, 2021 HF:

Please forecast expected GHG emission reductions out 20 years.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	12/5/2020	4/6/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/11/2021	4/20/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/20/2021	4/22/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/22/2021	4/27/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/25/2021	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval