



Crop Diversity Conservation for Sustainable Use in Indonesia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10511

Countries

Indonesia

Project Name

Crop Diversity Conservation for Sustainable Use in Indonesia

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

2/28/2022

Review completed by PM

6/22/2022

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

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

June 22, 2022 HF:

All comments cleared.

May 9, 2022 HF:

- 1.) Comment cleared. Please see follow-up comments on particular Components below.
- 2.) a.) The term PGRFA is used widely throughout the components, sometimes prefaced with "globally important". This doesn't seem to address the issue raised in the original comment. Further, it is unclear whether the use of the term PGRFA refers only to those crops included in Annex 1 of the ITPGRFA? And if so, that means two of the target crops (nutmeg and clove) would be excluded from Components 2, 3, 4 of the project. Given this we recommend the use of "**target crops**" throughout the CER and ProDoc which is a simple, consistent way to focus the scope of project interventions and reduce confusion. **Please revise accordingly.**
- b.) Outcome 2, for clarity, please redact first part of outcome language ("Threatened and globally unique plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA), including") and start the sentence with: "CWR and landraces (LRs) of target Indonesian crops...." This really clarifies that the focus of the entire project, including Component/Outcome 2, remains on the target crops, as agreed to in the approved PIF.
- c.) As previously requested, any changes, from PIF to CER, to Table B or other main elements of the project (cofinance, sites, targets etc) must be identified, explained and

justified. Please include a simple table that identifies, explains and justifies any proposed changes from PIF with sufficient detail.

Component 2: This component aims to enhance the conservation and use of selected crops and their crop wild relatives (CWR) for sustainable agricultural development, food security and environmental stability within the target region, catalyzing dynamic on-farm and in situ conservation of **the target** PGRFA. The Component will thereby contribute to the achievement of the target of the

3.) Initial comment cleared, but given this project is not an Impact Program, please redact alignment text referring to "Inclusive Conservation" and "Food Land Use and Restoration" as those are distinct stand-alone program investments for which this FSP does not qualify. Could consider including language from this section on IPLCs and alignment/coordination with FOLUR in the relevant sections of the PIF.

March 15, 2022 HF:

1.) No. The CEO endorsement document is a considerable deviation from PIF (and Table A). There have been significant changes in structure and focus from the approved project Components, Outcomes and Outputs, that not only alter the emphasis of the project but also the eligibility of the project under the GEF-7 biodiversity strategy. The CER now reads more like a project that is designed to support the implementation of the ITPGRFA rit large rather than the original project scope aimed at mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources with a modest component on the Nagoya Protocol (Component 1).

Revisions to the CER/ProDoc and TOC are required to realign it to the designated entry-points of the GEF-7 Biodiversity Strategy (BD 1-4 and BD 3-9) and approved PIF, including, but not limited to specific comments/feedback on the issues raised elsewhere in the review sheet. If limited changes are proposed, documentation of any changes/departure from the PIF should be recorded and justified accordingly in the appropriate CER section. Please also include a table that identifies, explains and justifies any proposed changes from PIF with sufficient detail.

2.) Table B and the corresponding project documentation includes generalized language such as: "and other important PGRFA" and "other important crop diversity"-which has the potential to broaden the scope of the project beyond the approved PIF and beyond what is eligible under the GEF-7 biodiversity strategy. The language in the approved PIF includes: "endemic", "native", "globally significant" crops and the **five target crops for this project** were very clearly defined and approved at PIF therefore: please refocus/revise the project design, components, outcomes and activities accordingly.

3.) Please revise section **4.) on Alignment with GEF focal area** per general comment elsewhere in review sheet on 'mutually supportive implementation' of NP and ITPGRFA.

Agency Response

RE May 9, 2022:

2.) a.) Thank you for the suggestion. The term PGRFA has been replaced with "target crops" throughout the CEO ER, as suggested. The term used was not limited to the crops in Annex 1 of the ITPGRFA but was used more generally. We agree with replacing it with "target crops" for clarity.

In instances referring to policy more generally, the term "plant genetic resources" is now used.

b.) Outcome 2 wording has been adjusted as suggested.

c.) Please refer to the table included in sub-section *8) Summary of changes in alignment with the project design with the original PIF* in Section *1.a Project Description* of the CEO ER. Additional information has been added in this table to identify, explain and justify the changes.

Please note that the target sites identified at PIF stage remain unchanged and were confirmed during PPG.

3.) The references to "Inclusive Conservation" and "Food Land Use and Restoration" have been removed from the Section *4) Alignment with GEF focal area*. Part of the text on IPLCs was included in Section *3) Alternative scenario*, instead (Output 4.3 description). Linkages with FOLUR are explained in Section *2) Baseline scenario* and Section *6.b Coordination with other initiatives*.

RE March 15, 2022:

1.) Major revisions have been made throughout the CEO ER and ProDoc to address these concerns. It has been made clearer that the project is aimed at mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources with a modest component on the Nagoya Protocol.

A table showing the changes from the PIF is now included in *Section 8) Summary of changes in alignment with the PIF*.

As explained in this section, some of the revisions in the outcomes and outputs had been made to address STAP and GEFSEC comments on the PIF related to improving the Theory of Change. These changes are, therefore, maintained. However, we believe that the revised outcomes and outputs now address the GEF concerns raised in this review sheet.

2.) The wording has been revised throughout the CEO ER and ProDoc. The reference to "and other important PGRFA" has been removed and it has been made clearer that the focus of the project is on the five identified globally important crop species, as indicated in the approved PIF.

In some instances, in particular under Component 1, the CEO ER and ProDoc still use the term "PGRFA" more generally as the policies/coordination mechanisms cannot exclusively focus on the five target species. Under Components 2, 3 and 4, however, the focus will be exclusively on the target species.

The main wording used in the revised version is "globally important target species" or in short "target species". The word "endemic", used at PIF stage, had been removed in the CEO ER as it is not considered fully accurate (the target species are native but not necessarily endemic, i.e., restricted to Indonesia). The word "native" is still used when referring to wild varieties that evolved without any human intervention; and "local" is generally used when referring to local varieties of cultivated crops.

3.) *Section 4) Alignment with GEF focal area* has been revised accordingly. Reference to the ITPGRFA has been removed.

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

May 9, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 15, 2022 HF:

1.) The GEFSEC was clear at PIF review stage (see multiple comments in PIF review sheet) to remove ITPGRFA from the project given GEF is not to financial mechanism for this treaty, the lack of any specific activities that clearly benefited the implementation of both Nagoya Protocol and ITPGRFA, and misalignment with the scope. Despite this, the ITPGRFA is mentioned 247 times in the CEO endorsement request document whereas Nagoya comes up 50 times.

If there is interest in exploring "mutually supportive implementation" of the ITPGRFA and the Nagoya Protocol (NP) in this project through Component 1 (BD strategy entry point 3-9 on Nagoya Protocol) this needs to include:

" A well-defined, limited set of activities aimed at "mutually supportive implementation" of ITPGRFA and the Nagoya Protocol under Component One (and 4) that contribute to meeting the project objective. This should include defining and describing the specific steps for implementation. Although "mutually supportive implementation" is mentioned in the project on multiple occasions, there is no clarity on the actual activities that will be carried out. To fully understand what the GEF will be financing, a clear description and graphic flow-chart of how the government will

address both the implementation of the Plant Treaty and NP and what work will be done to unify these processes for mutually supportive implementation would greatly facilitate the understanding of this issue.

? In the context of the point above the project could build on ?reviewing existing legislative, policy and administrative frameworks, and defining competent authorities and institutions? for mutually supportive implementation of ITPGRFA and NP. Please note, reference to the Multilateral System has been removed.

? Please provide specific Lessons Learned from other projects on ?mutually supportive implementation? of the Treaty and the NP to illustrate the process in the CER. Special efforts to document, understand, evaluate and share experiences regarding mutually supportive implementation of NP and ITPGRFA from the perspective of knowledge management and learning are also needed.

? Finally, if indeed limited, well-defined activities aimed at ?mutually supportive implementation? of the ITPGRFA and NP are identified for inclusion in Component 1, we recommend adding a column to Table 1 in the CER describing the Roles and Responsibilities of the Ministries in regard to the ITPGRFA.

Please revise CER/ProDoc accordingly.

Agency Response

RE March 15, 2022:

1. Reference to the ITPGRFA has been reduced throughout the CEO ER and ProDoc and only kept in few specific instances where it clearly benefits the implementation of both the Nagoya Protocol and ITPGRFA (or where it refers to FAO's environmental and social safeguards).

A better defined, limited set of activities supporting the mutually supportive implementation has been added, incorporating the suggestions from the review comments, as follows. Please refer to *Section 3) Alternative scenario* for details.

? The work related to ABS under Component 1 has been separated out into one specific output (new Output 1.5) with a well-defined, limited set of activities, described under new Output 1.5. These activities include:

- (i) Review existing legislative, policy and administrative frameworks related to ABS, including issues related to the institutional arrangements, PIC and MAT procedures, IPRs, IPLCs (BCPs and FPIC) and CHM^[1];
- (ii) Clarify roles and responsibilities, in particular in areas with partially overlapping mandates such as crop wild relatives and crops that are not on Annex 1, and on-farm/in situ conservation and management;
- (iii) Elaborate coordination mechanisms to ensure proper interface between the two instruments/sectors and facilitate exchange and coordination among the relevant agencies. This may also involve the establishment of an inter-

ministerial ABS committee after consultation with relevant agencies and stakeholders;

- (iv) Harmonize procedures related to ABS, in particular those relevant to the project implementation under Components 2, 3 and 4; and
 - (v) Build awareness and capacities related to ABS among relevant stakeholders/actors, including Masyarakat Adat, local communities, parliamentarians, and within the industries using genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge.
- ? An indicative flow-chart illustrating the mutually supportive implementation of the ABS mechanism has been prepared and is included in Output 1.5 description; to be further elaborated based on more in-depth analysis during implementation.
- ? Reference to the Multilateral System has been removed, except in instances when it refers to FAO's safeguards (ESS 3), as the project needs to ensure that the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol and the ITPGRFA are followed in case material associated with the project is shared through the MLS (which would not be done with GEF resources, but could be undertaken in parallel by the national authorities).
- ? An activity has been added under Output 4.3 to 'document the lessons learned and best practices of mutually supportive implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and the ITPGRFA regarding Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) and the realization of Farmer's and Masyarakat Adat Rights.'
- ? Lessons learned from other projects have been added in *Section 6.b Coordination*. The Crop Diversity project will build on the experiences and best practices developed under these projects.
- ? More details on the Roles and Responsibilities have been added in Table 1 (now moved to *Section 2) Baseline scenario*). However, it is suggested not to add a separate column related to the ITPGRFA, as this is covered in the column 'Roles and responsibilities relating to ABS'. More detailed analysis will be undertaken during implementation as part of new Output 1.5.

The project team would also like to provide the following clarifications:

- ? We have taken note of the Council comment from Canada, which 'noted with concern that all references to the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA) were removed ('in response to upstream GEFSEC comment to that effect?'), given that 3 out of the 5 target crops are on Annex 1 of the ITPGRFA [?].?' and recommended that 'the project reconsider implementing in accordance of the ITPGRFA; we would consider avoidance of this issue is to the detriment of this project and the stakeholders concerned.'
- ? It is noted that the project operates under the ABS frameworks of both the CBD and the ITPGRFA, depending on the materials involved and the purposes for which they are be acquired or provided.
- ? Additional information is included in the box 'Mutually supportive implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and the ITPGRFA' in *Section 3) Alternative scenario*.

[1] Prior Informed Consent (PIC), Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT), Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs), Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs), Biocultural Community Protocols (BCPs), Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), Clearing-House Mechanism (CHM)

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

May 11, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

May 8, 2022 HF:

Now it seems that the co-finance has decreased by nearly \$40 million during the revision of the CER. Please provide explanation/justification for the more than 40% decrease in co-financing for this project.

March 16, 2022 HF:

Noting the increase in co-financing for this project, but that nearly \$100 million in co-finance is all in-kind with zero investment mobilized. Please provide further explanation for this.

Agency Response

RE May 8, 2022:

We understand that this comment has now been cleared. The co-financing amount was increased from USD 58.6 million at PIF stage to USD 92.8 million at CEO ER stage.

RE March 16, 2022:

A revised co-financing summary was prepared by ICABIOGRD and has been uploaded into the GEF Portal. A majority of Government co-financing indeed consists of public investment (instead of in-kind), i.e., investment in programmes, facilities, etc. This has now been corrected in the Portal/CEO ER.

Note that Line 10 (Agriculture Agency of North Maluku) in the co-financing summary mistakenly indicates USD 423,238. The correct amount is USD 1,168,727 (IDR 16,735,000,000 as indicated in the North Maluku co-financing letter, see last table covering the period 2022-2026).

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 16, 2022 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

March 16, 2022 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

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

June 22, 2022 HF:

All comments cleared.

May 9, 2022 HF:

1.) Comment cleared.

2.) a.) All the GHG emissions mitigated should be reported as ?direct? in the core indicator section of the Portal (the capitalization phase generates ?post-direct? benefits, which are considered as direct). Please revise. In addition, describe how GEF activities to remove identified barriers, such as capacity building, innovation and catalytic action for replication, are expected to ensure that the improved forest management practices remain active after the life of GEF project.

•b.) Please review the GHG calculations given they currently only estimate carbon benefits from the 65,000 ha of forest reserves, whereas the project has targeted improving management to over 1.3 Million ha to benefit biodiversity. The GHG estimate is now based on only 5% of total hectarage without clear reasoning/justification. Given the significant project budget and the massive investments mobilized please review the GHG estimate, revise and provide clear justification for target.

•
March 17, 2022 HF:

1.) Please provide a qualitative description of the benefits provided to biodiversity conservation in these hectares per the GEF-7 results architecture, and the textbox below.

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified) ⓘ

Ha (Expected)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
1,300,000.00		1,300,000.00

Indicate the landscape area that is being managed to benefit biodiversity, but which is not certified. Please provide qualitative description of the benefit provided to biodiversity through the change in management. It is also suggested to provide GIS files showing the extent of the land under this improved management (outside of protected areas).

2.) If GHG emission mitigation benefits are expected from this change in management, please including targets calculated for Core Indicator 6.

Agency Response

RE May 9, 2022:

2.) a.) Thank you. We agree and this has been clarified in the CEO ER.

The following has been added in Section 6) *Global environmental benefits (GEBs)*:
?Through the project?s activities, including the enabling policies (Component 1), the establishment of CWR reserves, the development of management plans and collaboration mechanisms (Component 2), associated incentive mechanisms

(Component 3), and improved knowledge sharing (Component 3), it is expected that the improved forest management practices will remain active after the life of the GEF project. Additional indirect GHG mitigation benefits could be achieved through the long-term outcomes of GEF activities that remove barriers, such as capacity building, innovation, and catalytic action for replication. However, these cannot be quantified at the moment and would be added during project implementation, if appropriate.?

b.) The project team has reviewed the calculation and would like to maintain the current, conservative target based on the following justification: The improved management introduced by the project is primarily aimed at maintaining or increasing diversity of species (i.e., crop genetic resources), rather than improving soil organic carbon or reducing emissions. It is currently difficult to estimate any GHG mitigation benefits that would result from maintaining crop diversity and traditional practices, from improved agricultural practices, or from avoided conversion into industrial agriculture systems. The main benefits that can be quantified are from avoided forest degradation resulting from the conservation of genetic reserves, as included in the EX-ACT calculation.

RE March 17, 2022:

1.) A qualitative description of biodiversity benefits has been added in the text box below the Core Indicator targets, as follows:

The project interventions will result in enhanced ecosystems services and conservation of globally significant biodiversity through improved management in an area of 1.3 million hectares. Benefits to biodiversity resulting from the GEF investment include (1) conservation of globally significant biodiversity ? namely, globally unique varieties of rice (*Oryza* spp.), taro (*Colocasia esculenta* (L.) Schott), yam (*Dioscorea* spp.), cloves (*Syzygium aromaticum* syn. *Eugenia aromatica*), and nutmeg (*Myristica* spp.), (2) sustainable use of the components of globally significant biodiversity, and (3) fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources, including by appropriate access to genetic resources. The project will also result in enhanced ecosystem services through the promotion of sustainable agricultural practices and sustainable land and forest management.

2.) GHG co-benefits for this project are not considered significant as the improved management is primarily aimed at maintaining or increasing diversity of species, rather than improving soil organic carbon or reducing emissions. However, an EX-ACT calculation has now been prepared capturing the benefits from avoided degradation resulting from the conservation of genetic reserves.

As explained in *Section 6) Global Environmental Benefits*, the project is anticipated to result in 498,148 tons of CO₂e mitigated through avoided forest degradation in 65,000 hectares of crop wild relative (CWR) reserves across the three project sites (of which 25% direct, i.e. resulting from the direct project implementation during Years 1-5, and 75% indirect attributable to the long-term outcomes of GEF activities that remove

barriers, such as capacity building, innovation, and catalytic action for replication). This is based on the following assumptions:

- 1) The project interventions in Central Kalimantan will result in avoided forest degradation from low to moderate in 5% of the 30,000 ha of CWR reserve, resulting in 280,410 tons of CO₂e mitigated.
- 2) The project interventions in Central Java will result in avoided forest degradation from low to moderate in 5% of the 15,000 ha of CWR reserve, resulting in 30,798 tons of CO₂e mitigated.
- 3) The project interventions in North Maluku will result in avoided forest degradation from low to moderate in 5% of the 20,000 ha of CWR reserve, resulting in 186,940 tons of CO₂e mitigated.

The greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation benefits are summarized in the table below.

Activity	GHG mitigation benefits (tons CO₂e)
1) Avoided forest degradation in Central Kalimantan through the establishment of CWR reserves and associated incentive mechanisms (estimated 1,500 ha, i.e. 5% of 30,000 ha)	-280,410
2) Avoided forest degradation in Central Java through the establishment of CWR reserves and associated incentive mechanisms (estimated 750 ha, i.e. 5% of 15,000 ha)	-30,798
3) Avoided forest degradation in North Maluku through the establishment of CWR reserves and associated incentive mechanisms (estimated 1,000 ha, i.e. 5% of 20,000 ha)	-186,940
Total GHG mitigated	-498,148
<i>Of which direct (25%, Years 1-5)</i>	<i>-124,537</i>
<i>Of which indirect (75%, Years 6-20)</i>	<i>-373,611</i>

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

May 9, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 17, 2022 HF:

The CER elaborates land use change as a key driver (among others) of loss of agrobiodiversity/CWR in target geographies for target crops. Please further describe in this section of the CER, and integrate/emphasize the project activities (presumably Component 2) clear approaches to address this important driver across the significant hectares this project targets.

Agency Response

RE March 17, 2022:

This important driver is addressed through the following project interventions.

Additional clarifications have been added in *Section 3) Alternative scenario* to make this clearer.

1. Component 1: Under Output 1.2, the project will conduct a gap analysis of institutional, policy and legislation frameworks and capacities related to PGRFA conservation and sustainable use. This will also involve analysis of agricultural policies/subsidies and land use-related policies and frameworks. An action plan will be developed to address the identified gaps and capacity development needs.
 2. Based on this, under Output 1.4, the project will develop policy recommendations to mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA in national and subnational policies. This includes sectoral policies and plans, including agricultural policies/subsidies, and land use. Through these interventions, it is anticipated that policies will be improved to promote land uses that conserve and sustainably use local varieties of the target species, on farm and in the wild (including traditional land uses/ sustainable land and forest management).
 3. Component 2: Under Output 2.1, the project will establish an integrated conservation and use system, which maintains traditional farming systems and their diversity and implements effective forest conservation and sustainable harvesting. It will identify hotspots for *in situ* and on farm conservation and conduct a land tenure analysis in the identified areas, with the aim of promoting the conservation of traditional land use systems.
 4. The best practice manuals/training materials under Output 2.2 will highlight the importance of maintaining traditional diverse farming systems and of avoiding further land use changes and forest loss. Under this Output, the project will also establish at least 5 genetic reserves in identified CWR hotspots areas, and develop management plans for effective conservation of wild CWR populations. This is expected to contribute to addressing land use change.
 5. Under Output 2.3, it is noted that the identification of good practices and incentive mechanisms will also involve sustainable forest management and sustainable land management practices associated with the conservation and use of CWR and LRs.
 6. Finally, under Output 2.4, agriculture, environment and forestry agencies will be among the stakeholders engaged in the multi-stakeholder network to foster collaboration among the stakeholder and across conservation sites.
 7. Component 3: The market and non-market incentives to be developed under Component 3 are also aimed at providing incentives for sustainable land use and for conserving/maintaining traditional land use systems as opposed to conversion to other land uses (such as intensive agriculture).
- 2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 9, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 17, 2022 HF:

Please include associated baseline projects that will support the work under Component 1 on Nagoya Protocol.

Agency Response

RE March 17, 2022:

Information has been added in *Section 2) Baseline scenario* (p. 32 of the ProDoc), as follows.

?Baseline related to the Nagoya Protocol: MoEF has been implementing several activities to facilitate access to genetic resources (SDG in Bahasa) and benefit sharing, including (1) Access regulation on genetic resources (SDG) of wildlife species and its access and benefit sharing (ABS) stipulated through Minister of Environment and Forestry PermenLHK No. P.2 Year 2018 concerning Access on Wildlife Species Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing on its Utilization (KemenLHK, 2018), (2) the development of an Access and Benefit Sharing Clearing House (ABSCH) as the main tool to facilitate Nagoya Protocol implementation, and (3) an Online Permit System of SDG Utilization (SPOPSDG) for obtaining permits by the Competent National Authority in the area of forestry.[1] To facilitate access to technology transfer and genetic resources conservation and utilization activities in a sustainable way, the ABSCH contains information related to the Nagoya Protocol, the utilization of genetic resources (SDG), related to governing regulations of genetic resources, procedure for online access to SDG utilization, etc. In addition, the website ABSCH Indonesia is also useful as a means of exchanging information between ministries/agencies through the related nodes already provided on the website. Please also refer to Table 1 above regarding the Roles and responsibilities relating to ABS in Indonesia. National competent authorities were designated based on Presidential Regulation No. 165/2014 in line with sector specific mandates, these are Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, and the Ministry of Health. Indonesia has previously received support for the Nagoya Protocol implementation through the ASEAN Center for Biodiversity and the International Development Law Organization.[2]?

[1] <http://www.abschindonesia.menlhk.go.id> and <https://www.graccess.co.id/>

See also <https://chm.cbd.int/database/record?documentID=248249>

[2] <https://absch.cbd.int/en/database/NR/ABSCH-NR-ID-239223>

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

May 9, 2022 HF:

All comments cleared.

March 17, 2022 HF:

1.) Throughout the CER (Table B, TOC, alternative scenario etc) there are several different Project Objectives articulated. Please note that the Project Objective approved at PIF stage is contrasted with the Project Objective in the TOC and yet another Project Objective in the alternative scenario. See previous comments regarding the broadening out of the Project Objective (to all PGRFA versus the five target crops and language regarding globally significant/endemic diversity) and significant deviation from what was approved at PIF stage. **Please revise the Project Objective and therefore the project alternative scenario, to what was approved at PIF and within the bounds of GEF-7 BD focal area strategy entry points 1-4 and 3-9. Any changes from PIF must be identified, fully explained and justified.**

At PIF approval stage:

Project Objective

To strengthen the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant crop diversity, in the wild and on-farm, originating in Indonesia, through sustainable practices and improved capacities, a strengthened enabling environment, and the development of long-term incentive mechanisms

The TOC objective in the CER (noting that the alternative scenario contains yet another Project objective:

Project objective
Communities conserve PGRFA and benefit equitably from their sustainable use with increased livelihood opportunities, in particular for women and vulnerable social groups

2.) Once realignment-readjustment of the alternative scenario and project objective/components/outputs/activities is complete, please describe the assumptions regarding the causal pathways assumed between the project activities (e.g. assumed causality between the activity/action and the intended outcome/impact.) Current assumptions mostly focus on contextual conditions which are useful but incomplete.

3.) Once realigned ensure there is a clear linkage between the activities undertaken in Component 1 and remaining three components.

4.) Component 2: In realigned components/activities please ensure how the actual implementation/doing of the conservation/sustainable utilization of these CWR will

happen. Currently there seems to be a heavy focus on assessment, systems, survey, analysis, best practice development etc without clarity on how within the project the resources are actually going to be conserved (presumably based on this information-intensive approach). Please reemphasize/articulate in re aligned components. In addition, it is surprising to see activities such as "how to" manuals being proposed given the broad and deep experience of FAO and partners-don't these resources exist? And shouldn't this project merely use/adapt/update what exists to local contexts if needed?

5.) Component 3: At least at the Component level, this component seems to have dropped the emphasis on 'the development of market/non-market incentives and linkages in target sites' from PIF stage and now reads as a Component that seems to focus on 'evaluation', whereas action to actually mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of target agro-biodiversity was approved at PIF. Please clarify/revise.

Agency Response

RE March 17, 2022:

1.) The Project Objective has been made consistent across the CEO ER and ProDoc, as follows:

?To strengthen the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant Indonesian crop diversity, in the wild and on-farm, through sustainable practices and improved capacities, as well as strengthened enabling environment and the development of long-term incentive mechanisms?

This represents only minor changes in wording from the PIF to make the sentence easier to read. The emphasis is still on globally significant crops (the target crops are now clearly mentioned in the results framework).

2.) A more detailed description of the assumptions has been added in *Section 3) Alternative scenario* (see p. 39 of ProDoc).

3.) The following has been added in *Section 3) Alternative scenario*:

? Theory of Change description: ?The project will apply an iterative process where lessons learned from Components 2 and 3 will inform the development of policy recommendations and guidelines under Component 1; and where the capacities, plans and institutional mechanisms developed under Component 1 will be applied under Components 2 and 3.?

? Output 1.4: ?The policy recommendations developed under this Output will also incorporate lessons learned from the implementation of Components 2 and 3.?

? Component 2: ?This will also build on the capacities, plans and institutional mechanisms developed under Component 1.?

Output 2.1: ?This will also build on capacities, processes and institutional mechanisms developed under Component 1 (Output 1.5). At the same time, challenges and lessons learned related to ABS identified under Component 2 will inform the activities under Component 1.?

4.) The actual implementation will mostly be done through Output 2.2 ?Capacity of all stakeholders to deploy effective integrated, culturally sensitive and gender-sensitive conservation approaches [?] enhanced.? The Output has been reworded to make this clearer, by adding ?including through establishment of genetic reserves and community nurseries/participatory plant breeding?.

Details can be found in the Activity description of this Output:

- ? Activity 2.2.4: In consultation with relevant stakeholders, establish at least 5 genetic reserves in identified CWR hotspots areas, and develop management plans for effective conservation of wild CWR populations.
- ? Activity 2.2.5: Establish community nurseries/participatory plant breeding (where conditions exist) in each of the target provinces to conserve the target local crop diversity and facilitate access to quality seeds/planting material.
- ? Activity 2.2.6: Provide technical support to site coordinators in implementation and monitoring of conservation of CWR/LRs at target sites in line with the developed management plans, including the support of agricultural groups for women and other vulnerable groups.

An additional indicator has been added in the Results framework to make this clearer:

?Indicator 2.2b: No. of genetic reserves established and management plans developed?.

Under Output 2.3, the project will test/implement identified good practices and incentive mechanisms (e.g., PACS[1]) (Activity 2.3.2) and develop extension/ technical support, monitoring and verification systems to assess the implemented good practices and incentive schemes (Activity 2.3.3). The Output wording has been made clearer by adding the word ?adopted?.

Before Outputs 2.2 and 2.3 can be implemented, it is necessary to undertake more detailed assessment of the CWRs in situ and identify what the threats are, in order to be able to formulate necessary actions. This will be done under Output 2.1.

Additionally, under Component 3, the project will support private sector participation in on-the-ground conservation activities through partnerships between farmers and private sector as incentive providers for genetic resources, for example Sidomuncul (nutmeg and clove, etc.) and Maxindo (for yam and taro).

Regarding the ?how to? manuals: These will indeed build on existing materials, in particular those developed by Bioversity and FAO. This has been made clearer in Activity 2.2.2 description and relevant links have been added. These materials will need to be adapted to the local context.

5.) Component 3 wording has been revised to ?Development of market/non-market incentives and linkages in target sites for the globally important target PGRFA?, to be in line with the primary focus of the Outcome and Outputs under this Component, which is

on market/non-market incentives. Please refer to the Output description in *Section 3) Alternative scenario* for details.

[1] Payments for Agrobiodiversity Conservation Services.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 12, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 17, 2022 HF:

1. **Note that ex-situ conservation activities are not eligible under the GEF-7 biodiversity strategy**, as stated in the PIF. The current project design and documentation includes many ex-situ conservation activities. Please redact ex-situ conservation activities as these are not eligible for GEF-7 support.

Agency Response

RE March 17, 2022:

The reference to *ex situ* activities has been removed throughout the CEO ER and ProDoc.

A footnote has nevertheless been added under Output 2.1 description to ensure that the relevant safeguards are in place with regard to access and benefit sharing (in line with FAO's ESS 3), as some *ex situ* activities may take place in parallel with the project's activities. The following information is added in the footnote: "Threatened PGRFA may also be backed up in *ex situ* facilities (national gene banks) to better facilitate access and use of genetic resources and to safeguard these resources, following their characterization and evaluation. These *ex situ* activities would not be financed through GEF resources; however, the project and its executing agencies still need to ensure that any access and benefit sharing provisions are followed in such activities associated with the project, in line with national regulations and relevant international agreements." This is in line with former PIF Outcome 2.3 "Improving the linkages between ex situ and in situ conservation and on-farm management of PGRFA efforts".

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 12, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 17, 2022 HF:

1.) Please revise per previous comments (e.g. related to the new orientation of the project since PIF towards ITPGRFA implementation and need for realignment).

Agency Response

RE March 17, 2022:

1.) The section has been revised accordingly and reference to the ITPGRFA removed.

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

May 12, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 18, 2022 HF:

Yes, though please revise per overall revisions to the CER/ProDoc.

Agency Response

RE March 18, 2022:

The section has been revised accordingly.

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

May 12, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 17, 2022 HF:

1.) Please further describe the measures this project will take to make sustainable the provision of capacity-building support through institutionalization, sustainable finance and other means.

Agency Response

RE March 17, 2022:

1.) Information has been added in this section, and in Output 1.2 description, that the capacity building efforts will also involve institutionalization of the training programmes into the regular programmes of the relevant agencies.

Explanation has also been added that a financing plan will be developed under Output 1.4 and arrangements made for the implementation of the National Strategy and Action Plan, by assigning roles and responsibilities. Related to this, a target is included in the Results framework related to the ?Increased allocation of resources or budget towards the conservation and deployment of crop diversity.?

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

March 15, 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


May 12, 2022 HF:

Comments cleared.

March 15, 2022 HF:

1.) The description of stakeholder engagement in the CER references more information regarding stakeholder engagement with IPLCs in Annex G (workplan) but it is unclear where/whether Annex G contains additional information regarding stakeholder engagement. Please clarify.

2.) Please address the elements below in the Stakeholder engagement section.

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement 

Refer to GEF Policy and Guidelines on [Stakeholder Engagement](#). As part of this the above table and in line with the timeline outlined in Annex C indicative information, please describe strategic communication to build awareness of problems and solutions, and to support behavior change.

Agency Response

RE March 15, 2022:

1.) Regarding engagement of IPLCs, Activity 2.1.1 refers to the consultations to be held with local communities, in particular Masyarakat Adat, to ensure free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) and develop Masyarakat Adat Plans in line with the process described in Annex J. The other activities under Components 2 and 3 will also be implemented in close collaboration with local stakeholders. Additionally, Activity 5.5 includes ensuring the implementation and monitoring of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. Additional clarifications and reference to Activity 2.1.1 (Annex G) have been added in *Section 2. Stakeholders*.

2.) Relevant information has been added in *Section 2. Stakeholders*, as follows.

?The project will also use strategic communication to address gaps in awareness related to PGRFA. Under Output 3.4, the project will develop and implement a communication strategy to disseminate project results on value of target PGRFA. Capacity and awareness building on the conservation and sustainable use of PGRFA is included in Output 1.3. The capacity development programmes and incentive mechanisms implemented by the project will support knowledge, skills and behavioural changes to help achieve the project's goals.?

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 18, 2022 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

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 18, 2022 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

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

May 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 17, 2022 HF:

Yes.

1.) Please correct typo in the climate change risk analysis that lists 'rain' in first column, first row of historic trends and projected changes, whereas it presumably should read 'temperature'.

Agency Response

RE March 17, 2022:

1.) Thank you. The typo has been corrected.

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

June 22, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

May 12, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared. Please see previous comments regarding engagement of MoEF in co-execution throughout the project (not only for Output 1.5) given scope of project on ABS and Biodiversity Mainstreaming (BD entry point 1-4).

March 17, 2022 HF:

1. 1.) It is notable the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MOEF), as the National Focal Point for the Nagoya Protocol, is not a co-EA for this project and it is unclear why this is the case. As such it is strongly recommended the MoEF is brought in as a co-EA for this project, on the following basis:
 - o Component 1 of the project is aimed at the enabling environment including in support of the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.
 - o If limited, targeted activities on mutually supportive implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and ITPGRFA will be included in Component 1 (per previous comment) then the two ministries responsible for the Treaty (Min of Ag) and the NP (Min of Environment) are assumed to both be critical to mutually supportive implementation; and
 - o The remainder of the project funds and activities (outside of Component 1 on Nagoya Protocol) are aimed at mainstreaming biodiversity through sustainable use of plant and animal genetic resources which requires a multi-sectoral approach.

Agency Response

RE May 12, 2022:

Detailed discussions have been held between ICABIOGRD, MoEF and FAO to discuss implementation arrangements and secure the involvement of MoEF in the project, which is indeed critical. The exact modality is currently being finalized with MoEF. It is anticipated that MoEF will be engaged through Letter of Agreement (LOA) with FAO. MoEF's involvement will not only be for Output 1.5, but for all aspects related to biodiversity mainstreaming. MoEF is also a member of the PSC. This has been made

clearer in the CEO ER, Section 2) *Stakeholders*, sub-section 2. *Core Partners and their engagement in the project*.

RE March 17, 2022:

The implementation modality is currently being discussed between ICABIOGRD and MoEF. The Directorate General of Natural Resources and Ecosystem Conservation, Ministry of Environment and Forestry will be an Implementing Partner through Letter of Agreement (LOA) with ICABIOGRD or an Executing Partner through LOA with FAO. The MoEF, and specifically the Directorate General of Natural Resources and Ecosystem Conservation, in close coordination with ICABIOGRD, will co-lead activities linked to policy review and harmonization of procedures related to the Nagoya Protocol (Output 1.5) and the cross-sectoral policy platform (**Component 1**), and assessing the diversity and conservation status of target crops and wild relatives, establishing genetic reserves, as well as setting up an information system to monitor changes in the distribution of priority species (**Component 2**). In particular, MoEF will be responsible for implementation of Output 1.5 on ABS. This has been made clearer in the relevant budget line (line 42) in Annex A2.

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 18, 2022 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

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

May 9, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 18, 2022 HF:

Yes, although please align with changes made to CER/ProDoc.

Agency Response

RE March 18, 2022:

The section has been revised accordingly.

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

March 18, 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

March 18, 2022 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

March 18, 2022 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 18, 2022 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 29, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

June 24, 2022:

Please include Core Indicator 6 target (GHG mitigated): 498,148 (as per EX-ACT calculation) in the results framework.

May 12, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 18, 2022 HF:

Please revise per comments on Table B/CER/ProDoc.

Agency Response

RE June 24, 2022:

Thank you. Core Indicator 6 target has been included in the results framework (Annex A1 of the ProDoc, Annex A of the CEO ER).

All highlights have been removed.

RE March 18, 2022:

The Results framework has been revised accordingly.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 12, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 18, 2022 HF:

Please respond to the GEFSEC comments at PIF to be considered at CER stage (see below) and make necessary revisions.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 10, 2020 HF:

- 1.) Please include in project preparation/design and for CER stage assessment of CWR that are present in project sites for each of the target crops.
- 2.) Please understand that this project must concentrate on the Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and not on the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. GEF is not the Financial Mechanism for the ITPGRFA. Despite recent revisions to remove direct reference by name to ITPGRFA, Component 1 still contains language that could lead to that type of work. Please keep this in mind during project design and preparation and we will revisit at CER stage.
- 3.) Among other dimensions of Climate Change risk, in PPG, please assess/address the risks/vulnerability of target crops (and landscapes) to climate change, adaptive capacity and potential risks for the intended results/impacts of this investment.

Agency Response

RE March 18, 2022:

Responses have been added in *Annex B: Response to Project Reviews*.

1.) As explained in *Section 2) Baseline scenario*, initial baseline assessments were conducted in the three target areas during PPG. A summary is included in Section 2), and more detailed Baseline reports are available and can be shared with the GEF Secretariat upon request. In brief, the project areas include the following crop diversity and CWRs:

- ? **Kapuas, Lamandau and Seruyan Regencies in Central Kalimantan:** The combined online and field assessment conducted as part of the PPG concluded that significant levels of diversity of rice and taro continue to be maintained in Central Kalimantan. Local rice varieties are mostly conserved on-farm, while taro and yams occur both in cultivated fields and in semi-wild environments (taro and yam

are often planted below fruit trees). Participants of the Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) also mentioned the existence of wild relatives of rice although this is yet to be confirmed through more detailed surveys. Overall, 87 varieties belonging to six species were identified across the three studied regencies of Central Kalimantan. Out of these, 73 varieties belong to rice, one to greater yam, one to lesser yam, and nine to taro. In turn, it is not known whether any clove and nutmeg taxa are still extant in Central Kalimantan and filling this knowledge gap is something the Project will need to address.

- ? **Blora, Klaten, and Magelang Regencies in Central Java:** The preliminary assessment conducted in the three target regencies as part of the PPG concluded that significant levels of diversity of yams, taro and rice continue to be maintained on-farm and in wild or semi-wild environments. Reportedly, there is one native species of nutmeg in Java, *Myristica teysmannii*, known as the 'Japanese nutmeg', which was recorded in Central and East Java but that is now classified as Endangered (EN) in the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. This may continue to exist in some of the target areas, particularly in Magelang Regency.
- ? **Tidore and Bacan (South Halmahera) Islands in North Maluku** were selected due to their high levels of endemism, including of the celebrated Moluccan spices cloves (*Syzygium aromaticum*), nutmeg (*Myristica fragrans*) and their wild relatives. The preliminary assessment undertaken as part of the PPG concluded that significant levels of diversity of nutmeg and clove continue to be maintained in the target districts. Rice is no longer grown on Tidore or Bacan Islands, and traditional cultivars (*Oryza sativa* var. *javanica*) seem to have completely disappeared. On the other hand, taro and yams grow wild in various areas in North Maluku and are not intensively cultivated. The local taro 'komo' (*Colocasia esculenta*) mostly grows wild in forest areas, farming sites and home-gardens. Yams are reportedly no longer cultivated nor consumed.

It is noted that the project intends to work on all five target crops in each target region. Although the baseline assessments concluded that in some regions (e.g., North Maluku) the cultivation of rice, yams and taro is not widespread, populations of wild species and CWR of these species may still be present and useful to monitor/evaluate. More detailed surveys are to be carried out during implementation as described in the CEO ER.

2.) This has been revised accordingly as per comments at CEO endorsement request stage. Please refer to the responses above for details.

3.) A detailed climate risk analysis was conducted for the project and is attached as a separate document in the Portal. Information on the vulnerability of the crops/landscapes, adaptive capacity and risks related to the intended project results are included in the climate risk analysis document and in *Section 5) Risks*, sub-section (b) Climate Risk Analysis.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 22, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

May 12, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared. Please see previous comments regarding engagement of MoEF in co-execution throughout the project (not only for Output 1.5) given scope of project on ABS and Biodiversity Mainstreaming.

March 18, 2022 HF:

- 1.) Please update responses to each of the Council comments once the CER/ProDoc has been revised per comments in review sheet.
- 2.) Please elaborate a response/explanation to Germany's comment.

Agency Response

RE May 12, 2022:

Please refer to the response above regarding institutional arrangement. An additional clarification has been added in the response to Council comments that MoEF will be engaged not only in Output 1.5, but in all aspects related to biodiversity mainstreaming.

RE March 18, 2022:

- 1.) The responses have been updated accordingly.
- 2.) Additional information has been added in response to Germany's comment.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 12, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 18, 2022 HF:

- 1.) STAP comment #2 was in regards to the linkages of activities focused on the Nagoya Protocol under Component 1, with the remainder of the components. Once revisions to the project are made (including those regarding ITPGRFA), please update/revise response.

Agency Response

RE March 18, 2022:

1.) Well noted. An explanation has been added in this section that the processes and guidelines related to the Nagoya Protocol implementation will be directly applied through the field activities in Components 2 and 3, through the access and benefit sharing agreements with local communities and Masyarakat Adat, where relevant. Similarly, the experiences and lessons learned from Component 2 will inform the enhancement of processes and guidelines under Component 2 and 3.

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 18, 2022 HF:

Cleared.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 18, 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

June 29, 2022 HF:

Yes, all comments cleared. PM recommends this project for CEO endorsement.

June 24, 2022:

Please include Core Indicator 6 target (GHG mitigated): 498,148 (as per EX-ACT calculation) in the results framework.

Please remove highlights from documentation (ProDoc and CER etc).

June 22, 2022 HF:

Yes, PM recommends CEO endorsement.

May 24, 2022 HF:

No. Not at this time. Please respond to comments in the review sheet and resubmit. Please note since the 2nd cancellation date is June 3rd, 2022 and given the ongoing review and revisions, we cannot ensure CEO endorsement prior to this date. Extension request letter from the OFP is currently under GEFSEC review.

March 18, 2022 HF:

No, not at this time.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	3/17/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/12/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/24/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/29/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations