

Crop Diversity Conservation for Sustainable Use in Indonesia

Review PIF 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

3/17/2020

Review completed by PM

4/14/2020

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

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 1, 2020 HF:

4.) mistakenly references objective 1-1 of the BD strategy (mainstreaming) when the project falls under 1-4 Sustainable use of plant and animal genetic resources (and 3-9 on Nagoya). Please correct.

April 10, 2020 HF: Comment cleared.

April 16, 2020 HF: The **information table indicates of the PIF this is a MFA project** while table A and D shows only BD focal area. Same with the LoE. The PIF should be classified as a BD project-please correct the info table.

April 16, 2020 HF: Comment cleared.

1.

Agency Response

This has been addressed.

Response to 16 April 2020 comment: This has been changed to biodiversity

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 1, 2020 HF:

1.) **Please remove all references from the PIF to the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and the Commission on GR for Food and Agriculture** (per the response to upstream GEFSEC comment to that effect). For example (not inclusive list, just some for-instances): Component 1 still reads: *“In recognition of the importance of crop genetic resources, the mutually supportive implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture will be also addressed”* and references under the "coordination" section. Please rectify and remove from these section, and all other sections of the PIF that contain reference to these efforts.

2.) Component 1 reads: *“This component will also support national implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and targeted capacity building to facilitate ratification of the Protocol and other relevant instruments As such, core activities will be undertaken to comply with the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol.”* This is much too vague, even for the PIF stage. Please explicitly describe the proposed activities that will be executed under this project (including those related to capacity building) for implementation of the NP.

3.) What resulted from the regional Project on the Nagoya Protocol ID 3853 *Building Capacity for Regionally Harmonized National Processes for Implementing CBD Provisions on Access to Genetic Resources and Sharing of Benefits*. And how does the current proposed concept build on what was achieved?

4.) Please provide clarification about what is meant by “the focus will be on ensuring harmonization of the mechanisms for ABS and farmers right as mandated under the Nagoya Protocol” as farmers rights are not mandated under the NP. Please clarify/explain.

5.) Please note that GEF funds should not support any ex-situ activities, please exclude or use co-finance.

April 10, 2020 HF:

1.) Comment cleared. Please see caveat and request contained in the issues for PPG/CEO endorsement request.

2.) Comment cleared.

3.) Please integrate response into PIF section on baseline investments.

4.) Comment cleared.

5.) Comment cleared.

April 14, 2020 HF:

3.) Comment cleared.

Agency Response

1) References from the PIF to the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture and the Commission on GR for Food and Agriculture have been removed from the PIF.

2. This has been clarified under the section outlining project Outcomes and also under the section on alignment to GEF strategy.

3 Indonesia was a part of the regional Project on the Nagoya Protocol ID 3853 Building Capacity for Regionally Harmonized National Processes for Implementing CBD Provisions on Access to Genetic Resources and Sharing of Benefits. This project assisted participating countries to implement ABS by providing the opportunity for them to complete a national policy and regulatory regime, make further progress in developing draft national ABS laws and regulations, or to develop, or build the foundation for developing, a draft national ABS framework. The final evaluation of this project reported that the project achieved its objective of increasing understanding and capacity to a lesser degree – stakeholders’ participation in the project enhanced their motivation to participate in implementing ABS more than it was able to build their capacity to do so. The Project focused on disseminating existing tools for implementing ABS, making them available and explaining them to all participating countries and sharing of lessons between participating countries. The Project was found to have been more effective in motivating stakeholders to participate

in implementing ABS.
(https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/22411/2820_3853_4415_3801_3855_2017_environment_gef_abs%20portfolio_Evaluation%20Synthesis%20Report.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)

4) This has been removed.

5) There are no *ex situ* conservation activities that will be supported by the GEF. This is now explicit under Output 2.3.1 in the section on Component description.

Response to April 10 Comment

3. The text has been inserted into the Baseline investment section.

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

April 1, 2020 HF: Yes.

April 16, 2020 HF: For any **co-financing** from national or sub-national government authorities, please use "government" rather than "beneficiaries" in the "source" column. In addition, where co-financing is provided by a GEF Agency that is not the implementing Agency of the project, please use "Donor Agency" rather than "GEF Agency" in the co-financing table. For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines.

April 16, 2020 HF: Comments cleared.

1.

Agency Response

Response to 16 April comment:

All local government co-finance has been now labelled "Government" and IFAD has been changed to "Donor Agency".

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 April 1, 2020 HF: Yes

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion April 1, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion April 1, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response

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

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 April 1, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2020 HF:

200,000 hectares under improved management seems like a very low return on investment for this project (given that the total financing will top \$65 million). Please include a discussion of how this target was derived and here are couple of questions/suggestions:

- 1.) Please include the entire range of the target species in Indonesia in the target for indicator 4 (rather than just the site-level impacts).
- 2.) Are numbers available for how many CWR are present in each site for each of the target crops? If so, please include.

April 10, 2020 HF:

To adequately address the comments above, please:

1.) a.) "Include a discussion of how the hectare target was derived."

b.) Also, we recommend including the entire range of the target species in Indonesia in the target for indicator 4 (rather than just capturing the site-level impact area)- does the new 500,000 hectare target include the entire ranges for all species?

2.) Comment cleared. Please revisit in PPG and include assessment CER stage.

April 14, 2020 HF:

1.) a.)

b.) Comment cleared.

Agency Response

1. The target has been revised to 500,000 ha and will be further assessed during PPG.
2. The numbers of CWR at each site is unknown, but Annex D now lists some known species for selected crops from Indonesia.

Response to April 10 comment

The overall target has been revised to 1 300 000 ha.

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 April 1, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response

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 1, 2020 HF:

Yes, though this description refers to "prevalent plant biodiversity"-please describe how this aligns with the focus of the GEF on the conservation of biodiversity of global significance.

April 10, 2020 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response This has been addressed in the PIF.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2020 HF:

How will this project interface with (complement, build on) the project described below?

The International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture covers the main target crops of the project under its Annex 1. The Benefit Sharing Fund supports the activities of the Treaty through grants allocated to stakeholders for the conservation and sustainable use of crops. Specifically, a project financed by the Access and Benefit Sharing Fund is ongoing and focuses on the conservation and sustainable utilization of the underutilized taro to increase food security and improve livelihood of marginalized communities faced with climate change in Malaysia, Indonesia, Philippines and Fiji.

April 10, 2020 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

This has been addressed in the PIF –the project has not yet been funded.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2020:

Overall a higher level of detail/specificity is needed to describe the activities envisioned under each of the components and outcomes-this can happen in the 'alternative scenario' or other project description section-but more specificity is needed. For instance, Component includes: "Development of on-farm conservation approaches and technologies will ensure long term, demand-driven conservation of local varieties." Please describe what on-farm conservation approaches are envisioned under this proposed project. The previous questions related to the ABS activities further reflect the need for increased specificity/detail. Please revise throughout and include more detail/specifics for review.

April 10, 2020 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

This has been addressed and more detail has been provided in the Component description section of the document.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2020 HF:

It looks like there is a mistaken reference to objective 1-1 of the BD strategy (mainstreaming) when the project actually falls under 1-4 Sustainable use of plant and animal genetic resources (and 3-9 on Nagoya). Please correct.

April 10, 2020 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response This has been corrected.

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 1, 2020 HF:

1.) As requested elsewhere in review, please remove reference to this activity in this section: "The project will also promote the development of policies, measures and mechanisms for the mutually supportive implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture."

2.) Please further articulate what exactly is the 'additionality'/GEF increment for this project.

April 10, 2020 HF:

Comments cleared.

Agency Response Please refer to updated project description section.

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 1, 2020 HF:

1.) It is good to see a scaling-back of sites/species given the scope of what is expected from this investment, but we are still a bit surprised given the level of GEF resources (\$7 million), and co-finance (\$58 million) that only 200,000 hectares are expected to be impacted. Please explain.

2.) Please see previous comment and include the entire range of the target species in Indonesia in the target for indicator 4 (rather than just the site-level impacts).

April 10, 2020 HF:

Closing out this thread to continue dialogue in indicators section of the review sheet. Please see follow-up questions there.

Agency Response

See earlier response to this comment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

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 1, 2020 HF: Yes.

April 16, 2020 HF: On **Stakeholder Engagement** (comment provided by Pilar): The PIF includes a description of how different stakeholders (including Local Communities in the five selected districts, and private sector) will participate in the project and what their roles will be. However, there's no description about the consultations conducted during the project development phase with any of the stakeholder groups that were consulted, i.e. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities; Civil Society Organizations; and Private Sector Entities. Please note that the Policy requires that at PIF stage: 'Agencies provide a description of **any consultations conducted** during project development...' Therefore, please provide a description about the consultations that were conducted with those stakeholders.

April 16, 2020 HF: Comment cleared.

For preliminary geo-reference question (above, but text box is still malfunctioning):

April 1, 2020 HF:

Thank you for the maps provided. Please also provide the site coordinates.

April 10, 2020 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

The coordinates have now been included.

Response to April 16 comment: information has been provided on key stakeholders consulted in preparation of the PIF.

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 2, 2020 HF: Yes. Noting that: "The project will ensure gender assessments in the proposed landscapes during PPG to inform gender sensitive project development and implementation."

April 10, 2020 HF: Please provide a description of gender dimensions relevant to the project (e.g. in the sectors/geographies that the project will focus).

April 14, 2020 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Response to April 10 Comments

The following text has been inserted in the PIF:

FAO's assessment of country gender assessment of agriculture and the rural sector in Indonesia (2019)^[1] has highlighted the important role women play in agriculture and natural resources management in the country. The report notes "In terms of the role of gender in protection o biodiversity, it is assumed that while men tend to be more concerned over soil and land conservation, women tend to be more concerned over biodiversity conservation, especially in relation to plants. A study

in South and Southeast Sulawesi asserts that this is in line with men's and women's gender roles; i.e. they are most concerned with what they deal with most often in their daily lives. Usually, men deal with issues of soil and land erosion or landslides while women have the responsibility of fulfilling household nutrition, for which they rely on a variety of plant species from mixed gardens for food, as well as for medicine and making simple tools (Mulyoutami et al., 2012).” Furthermore, it notes “women of Indonesia have traditionally been bearers and keepers of seeds that support the food security of their communities. In this sense, their overall contribution to flora biodiversity is significant. Additionally, they are holders of knowledge of traditional skills connected to their livelihoods, such as shifting cultivation/rotational agriculture and gathering of non-timber forest products, among others (Maranan, 2015)”

The report notes, “In rice production, although predominantly a male activity, women are involved in seeding, planting, fertilizing, weeding/ cleansing the grass and harvesting. Preparation of land is the only task usually done by men alone (Ekowati et al., 2009; Maimunah 2014). Several case studies show the involvement of women in managing farming, seed preparation (including seed selection and seeding), fertilization, harvesting and marketing.”

The report also highlights: “Additionally, women play a primary role in intercropping activities such as planting long beans, yams, taro and some other vegetable crops. These foods are used for the daily needs of the family. Rural women are also responsible for maintaining their home yards, planting vegetables for family consumption and/or sale”

The role of indigenous women as seed keepers and knowledge on seeds have also been highlighted by several studies. For example, in Kalimantan, women's key role in local food systems as seed keepers and preserve many varieties of rice, sorghum, corn, millet but also tubers and vegetables has been reported^[2]. In addition, roles of specific rank of women within the society also seems to play an important role in their knowledge of traditional varieties in some cases. In one case, amongst the Benuaq society around Muara Lawa District, of the 103 rice varieties that are found there, it was found that in general, all farmers could recognize about 40 % of the existing local varieties. Only the the senior members of the Benuaq society (such as the traditional law leader or the Mantiq, his wife, and three senior farmers) were able to identify all the rice varieties.

The important role women play in maintaining home gardens/ agroforests that includes cloves and nutmeg has also been reported from Indonesia – such as in Sulawesi^[3]. Here, women have been reported to play more role in tree crop selection than men.

[1] <http://www.fao.org/3/ca6110en/ca6110en.pdf>

[2] <http://wwf.panda.org/?339311/Women-as-Biodiversity-Stewards-in-HoB>

[3] Women's participation in agroforestry: more benefit or burden? A gendered analysis of Gorontalo Province

Family consumption and/or sale

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 1, 2020 HF:

It is clear that the PS will be an important player in this project but please more fully describe they approach to private sector engagement and the role of the PS in the project (building on the list of specific players that have been identified and their respective roles as is currently included in PIF).

April 10, 2020 HF: Although the response states PS is included in the stakeholders table with their respective roles, I don't see the private sector stakeholders included in the table on page 39. Please include.

April 14, 2020 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Private sector engagement and their potential roles have been highlighted in the table of stakeholders. This will be further elaborated during PPG stage, and will also build on private sector engagement for rice sector in FOLUR project.

Response to April 10 comment: please see table section highlighted in blue.

Risks

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 1, 2020 HF:

- 1.) Please include the overall project risk classification.
- 2.) Please include any relevant supporting documentation regarding ESE risk review (including screening report or preliminary Environmental and Social Risk and Impact Assessment report).
- 3.) The current risk rating table does not identify any social risks, which is surprising given the potential work with IPs and local communities. Please explain or amend.
- 4.) Co-finance: Please re-asses the ‘low’ risk rating of ‘co-finance’ risk (and the potential impacts) in the context of the current COVID-19 pandemic and the profound economic impacts that are sure to result, including in Indonesia.
- 5.) Climate change: To what extent are the target landscapes and crops vulnerable to climate change and currently feeling the impacts (e.g. is the future viability of any of the crops thought to be threatened by climate change)? How is such a risk being taken into account in this design?

April 10, 2020 HF:

- 1.) Comment cleared.
- 2.) I only see the risk certification which provides minimal information. Please include the FAO checklist and other relevant risk/ESE review documentation.
- 3.) Comment cleared.
- 4.) Comment cleared.
- 5.) Comment cleared. Among other dimensions of CC risk, in PPG, please assess/address the risks/vulnerability of the crops (and landscapes) to climate change, adaptive capacity and potential risks for the intended results/impacts of this investment.

April 14, 2020 HF: All comments cleared.

Agency Response

1. The overall risk classification is medium risk. Please see section 5 Risks.
2. Supporting document has been uploaded on Document section
3. The revised risk table includes risk related to IP
4. Co-finance risk has been re-assessed as medium
5. Climate risk has been expanded. This will be further developed during full project proposal phase.

Response to April 10 comment

The full ESS checklist is now available as Annex E of the uploaded revised PIF, as well as separate uploaded document.

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 1, 2020 HF:

Please describe how this project complements/coordinates with, in particular Indonesia FOLUR child project, or others in selected sites or at that national level.

April 10, 2020 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response **Text has been added under coordination section.**

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

April 1, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response

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 1, 2020 HF:

Please provide a better developed proposed approach to KM including the following types of information:

- an overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the project concept?
- plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives & evaluations?
- proposed processes to capture, assess and document info, lessons, best practice & expertise generated during implementation?
- proposed tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning & collaboration (at both program and project levels if a PFD)?
- proposed knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders (at both program and project levels if a PFD)?
- a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project/program impact and sustainability
- plans for strategic communications?

April 10, 2020 HF: All comments cleared.

Agency Response Knowledge managements section has been updated.

Part 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

March 28, 2020 HF: The associated submission unfortunately does not include a valid LOE signed by the current OFP. The GEF TF amounts indicated in the letter and inconsistent with the figures in the submitted PIF. Therefore we cannot proceed with the project review until this is rectified and resubmitted with a valid LOE.

April 1, 2020 HF: Comment cleared.

April 10, 2020 HF: Please include the date of the OFP LOE in the Portal section on Country Endorsement.

April 14, 2020 HF: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

The project budget has been changed on the portal to reflect the LOE from the OFP, which are the final agreed budget for this project from STAR allocation. The previously entered budget was incorrect, and had been entered prior to LOE issuance.

Response to April 10, 2020 – this has been done

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

GEFSEC 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 1, 2020 HF: No, not at this time. Please address comments in review sheet and resubmit.

April 10, 2020 HF: No, not at this time. Please address comments in review sheet and resubmit.

April 14, 2020 HF: Yes, project and PPG recommended for technical clearance.

April 16, 2020 HF: No, please address comments on: **mis-classification of project as an MFA, co-financing and stakeholders.**

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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 the crops (and landscapes) to climate change, adaptive capacity and potential risks for the intended results/impacts of this investment.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The project objective is 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 project has four components: 1.) Strengthen the enabling environment to promote the conservation and sustainable use of the plant genetic diversity of important endemic local crops and varieties; 2.) Conservation and utilization of selected crops and their crop wild relatives' species are ensured for sustainable agricultural development, food security and environmental stability; 3.) Mainstreaming diversity of local varieties through biological, socio-cultural and economic evaluation and the development of market/non-market incentives and linkages in target sites; and 4.) Strengthening knowledge management.

The outcome of the project is improved *in situ* and on-farm conservation and sustainable use of globally important crop diversity in Indonesia, through improved conservation practices, a strengthened enabling environment, and the development and demonstration of long-term incentive mechanisms. The GEF-supported activities will be integrated into all of the components of the project and will include documenting local agrobiodiversity, including crop wild relatives, and assessing the values, threats and competitiveness of crops relevant to the rural poor, within a climate change context. It will enhance the capacities of stakeholders in documenting, monitoring, conserving and using crop diversity in the wild and the associated knowledge on-farm. Exploring relevant policy options and collaborative frameworks are therefore essential for strengthening pro-poor on-farm conservation as well as a major focus will be placed on developing value chains and promoting employment and entrepreneurship for young women and men.

The project will promote the conservation and sustainable use of crop diversity for food security as: the region is rich with many native crops, resistant to abiotic and biotic stress and characterized with great intra- and inter-specific diversity; the rich diversity of wild species present in the region are threatened by overexploitation,

overgrazing, drought and desertification; and the diversity of old local varieties by replacement with a few modern ones; and the development of *in situ*/on farm conservation and sustainable use of local horticulture varieties can support increased sustainable agricultural production and conservation of agricultural biodiversity.

The five target crops to be addressed within the project are of global and national significance. These species, identified as priority crops by the Ministry of Agriculture, are also identified under the Vavilov centre of diversity 7A: Rice (*Oryza* spp.), Taro (*Colocasia esculenta*), Yam (*Dioscorea* spp.), Cloves (*Syzygium aromaticum* syn. *Eugenia aromatic*), and Nutmeg (*Myristica fragrans*). Target sites have been selected for their diverse landscapes and are representative of the three ecoregions of Indonesia. Central Kalimantan (Lamandau, Seruyan and Kapuas Districts), Central Java (Klaten, Blora, Magelang Districts), North Maluku (Tidore and Bacan Islands).

Innovation, Sustainability and Potential for Scaling Up: The project will build on the baseline of commitments from the different Ministries (Agriculture, Environment and Forestry, Villages, and Planning), the GEF focal area mandate and the opportunities for transformational impact. The project will develop partnerships across sectors through the planning of the activities, their implementation and the periodic monitoring and evaluation. The establishment of effective partnerships institutions that have formerly had not collaborated closely will be innovative at the national level and crucial to the success of the project. Once the linkages have been established and effective working partnerships formed, it is expected that Indonesia will be well placed to act as a hubs for Crop Wild Relatives (CRW) conservation and on-farm management of plant genetic resources in the region and globally. Sustainability will be addressed through significant emphasis placed on developing capacity for maintenance and management of the crop diversity in the wild and on-farm, with activities focused on participatory decision making and implementing conservation actions. The project will also support the development of an exit strategy to ensure sustainability of its actions.

The project is expected to contribute to effective in-situ conservation of over 1300,000 ha of rice, taro, yam, clove and nutmeg varieties through farmer management and their wild relatives in different parts of Indonesia and reach 20,000 beneficiaries.