

Land and Ecosystem National Threat Evaluation and Risk Assessment (LENTERA)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12276
Countries
Indonesia
Project Name
Land and Ecosystem National Threat Evaluation and Risk Assessment (LENTERA)
Agencies
IUCN
Date received by PM
2/4/2026
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Hannah Fairbank
Focal Area
Biodiversity
Project Type
MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments
HF April 2026

Cleared.

HF March 2026

a.) Yes, though please see comment below project TOC and components and how this project (GEFTF & co-finance) needs to go beyond assessment into implementation. Please address and update concept throughout.

2.) No. According to the "programming of funds" table this is a BD project, not an MFA. Therefore, in the General Project Information table please designate BD as the GEF focal area. And make all corresponding changes to the PIF for BD alignment accordingly.

Agency's Comments
IUCN, March 31 2026

a. Thank you for the valuable comment. This has now been addressed. There are now relevant lines (e.g. in the project's approach and baseline investment section as well as the project description section) about how the government's co-financing will support implementation on the ground and how the local compliance and enforcement in the long run will become a lynchpin triggering positive environmental outcomes.

b. Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that BD has been designated as the focal area for this project both in the portal as well as the word versions.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments
HF May 2026

Cleared

HF April 2026

Update summary to include core indicator targets for the project.

HF March 2026

1.) Please shorten to under the 250 word limit.

2.) Update to reflect changes in the TOC and design.

Agency's Comments
IUCN, May 6 2026

Thank you very much for your comment.

Kindly note that the project summary is now updated to include core indicator targets for the project.

IUCN, March 31 2026

Thank you very much for your comments.

1. The project summary has now been shortened.
2. The TOC has been updated to reflect better the causal changes related to implementation on the ground and resulting environmental benefits

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

HF May 2026

Cleared

HF March 2026

Yes. Write out RLE the first few times before using the acronym alone.

Agency's Comments

IUCN, March 31 2026

Thank you very much for your comment. RLE has now been spelled out several times before the acronym is used alone.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

HF April 2026

Cleared.

HF March 2026

Please include in Section 9.2 of the Review Sheet:

- 1.) In the development of the Gender Analysis and Action Plan, please ensure that the activities developed are included in the project documents, and that the GAP aligns with the project components.
- 2.) Please ensure that in the development of the results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting. Please indicate measures to facilitate and

support the implementation of the GAP (e.g., budgets, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.).

3.) Please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

Agency's Comments
IUCN, March 31 2026

1. Many thanks for the comment. It is well noted and will be addressed in the PPG phase of the project

2. The comment is acknowledged and will be subsequently addressed.

3. The reference has been added to the PIF within the section 'Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment?.'

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments
HF April 2026

Cleared.

HF March 2026

a.) M&E has no allocated resources from co-financing - please revise.

b.) Nearly. Please realign these (e.g. same percentage allocated from GEFTF and co-finance resources to PMC).

c.) Yes.

Agency's Comments
IUCN, March 31 2026

a. Thank you very much for the comment. Kindly note the there is now co-financing shown against M&E at the same proportion is that for the overall cofinancing against the GEF financing budget

b. Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that the PMC cofinancing has been revised to reflect the correct proportion.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

HF March 2026

Yes.

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

HF April 2026

Cleared.

HF March 2026

a.i) Please describe how/why the project sites were identified and criteria used.

ii.) Provide further background on PP 26/2025 which is a basis for this project it seems.

b.) Yes.

c.) Please address how this project will collaborate with the GEF-8 project GEFID 12003 UNDP that is focused on the conservation of Karst ecosystems in Indonesia, in particular (but

not exclusively) Component 1. Outcome 1.1 "Enhanced policy coherence, institutional coordination, and regulatory mechanisms that support inclusive and science-based management of karst ecosystems across Indonesia" that includes both: Output 1.1.1 National Karst Inventory and 1.1.2 Multi-stakeholder Karst Forum.

d.) Stakeholder engagement: please provide additional details on the specific NGOs, civil society, indigenous Peoples and local community groups and associations consulted in project design.

Agency's Comments
IUCN, March 31 2026

Thank you very much for your comments.

a.i. This has now been addressed. Several sentences have been added to reflect the ecological, geographic, and operational criteria.

a.ii. The section on PP26/2025 has now been expanded to include additional relevant information.

c References to and linkages with the BIO-KARST project have been added both in the table about alignments as well as the section on project's approach and baseline investments

D Additional information about NGPs consulted has been added

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments
HF May 2026

Cleared

HF April 2026

a.i.) The TOC graphic in the Portal entry is still illegible. Please update.

Rest are cleared.

HF March 2026

- a.i) The TOC graphic is illegible. Please upload a higher resolution/clearer TOC.
 - ii.) Please address a key causal assumption that seems to be missing in order to reach the project objective (e.g. "Safeguarding Indonesia's threatened ecosystems"), that is: going from 1.) data and systems are present and actionable; to: 2.) identification of "legally binding zones"; which results in 3.) positive biophysical outcomes. #3 should then be incorporated into the project's TOC and M&E framework (since the causal pathways identify key assumptions/logic jumps to monitor).
 - iii.) Include in each causal pathway, the causal assumptions that are present in each of these barrier-action-result statements.
 - iv.) Please include a narrative paragraph that describes the TOC of this project.
- b.) Output 1.2 refers to "priority ecosystems" how are these identified? How many are expected? This may impact the scope or intensity of implementation.

Agency's Comments
IUCN, May 6 2026

Thank you very much for your comment.

Kindly note that we have uploaded a higher resolution version of the TOC graphic in the portal.

IUCN, March 31 2026

Thank you very much for your comments.

- a.i. Kindly note that this has been provided and a higher resolution TOC has been uploaded.
- a.ii.1. This has now been addressed. A few sentences have been added to further explain the causal assumption.
- a.iii. Causal assumption for each of the causal pathways has been added.
- a.iv. A new narrative paragraph to explain the ToC has been added after the IF-THEN-BECAUSE paragraph.
- b. The "priority ecosystems" targeted in Output 1.2 are directly linked to the 22 Priority Ecosystems formally identified in the Indonesian Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (IBSAP 2025-2045), as outlined in Activity 1.1. Activity 1.2 is a national-scale, desk-based geospatial exercise rather than a field-level intervention. The process involves overlaying these 22 harmonized ecosystem typologies which will be cross-walked with the IUCN Global Ecosystem Typology (GET) onto official national ecoregion maps to establish standardized spatial units for the National Environmental Inventory (*Inventarisasi*). Because this activity focuses on enhancing the national database architecture and aligning macro-level spatial data with legal frameworks (PP 26/2025), the number of ecosystems assessed at this tier will not

affect the scope, budget, or intensity of the project's on-the-ground implementation. The actual intensity of field implementation and empirical data collection is strictly bounded by the subsequent step (Activity 1.3), which deliberately narrows the focus to conducting in-depth, participatory RLE landscape assessments exclusively within the three designated pilot ecoregions (Sumba, Banggai, and Muna-Buton).

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments
HF March 2026

Yes.

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments
HF April 2026

Cleared.

HF March 2026

a.) Please revise language in this sentence to read **executed** rather than implemented (since IUCN is the implementing Agency and the Ministry the executing partner: "This project will be implemented by the Ministry of Environment (KLH/BPLH)."

b.) Please redact reference to possible dual execution at this stage. Please note that execution by the GEF implementing agency (in this case IUCN) is prohibited in GEF policy to avoid conflict of interest or appearance of such, and to support capacity building of local and national institutions. There are specific provisions for exceptions to this GEF policy (per: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2025-10/GEF_C.70_Inf.18_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_1_0.pdf) and 'dual execution' is always the last resort.

c.) Yes, though please include the aforementioned GEF-8 UNDP project on Karst conservation in this list.

Agency's Comments

IUCN, March 31 2026

a. Thank you very much for your comment. As advised, we have now replaced implemented with executed.

b. Thank you very much for your comment. We have removed all references to execution by IUCN

The BIO-KARST project has now been included

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

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 19 May 2026

Cleared

HF May 2026

a.) vi. Please submit an updated EXACT excel sheet in line with project design. The current sheet outlines 17 MtCO_{2e}, while the table reports 8 MtCO_{2e}.

vii.) The current excel sheet identifies 200,000 ha being restored (half shrubland, half dry forest). BUT: The project document only refers once to 100,000 ha of landscape under improved management, mainly through fire management. If these 100,000 ha are the ones agency meant to reflect in the calculation, an issue is that improvement through fire management is not captured adequately on the EXACT excel sheet > instead of adjusting the degradation levels to very low with project instead of medium without and low in the initial situation - proponents should use the fire periodicity and impact columns - please see below illustrative example for reference:

5.1 FOREST DEGRADATION & MANAGEMENT										
Type of forest vegetation that will be managed	Forest degradation level			Fire occurrence		Fire periodicity		Fire impact (% burnt)		For
	Start	Without	With	Without (y/n)	With (y/n)	Without Year	With Year	Without	With	
Please select Tropical shrubland	Please select Low	Please select Low	Please select Low	NO	NO	1	1	1.0%	1.0%	10
				YES	YES	1	2	2.0%	1.0%	

If the areas that proponents wanted to reflect are rather the 30,000 ha of forest restoration from CI 3.2 and 20,000 ha of savannah restoration from CI 3.3., then (i) these should be the input data computed in the excel sheet, (ii) the selection of degradation levels should be more

conservative, using the same level in the scenario without project as the start situation, please see below illustrative example for reference:

FOREST DEGRADATION & MANAGEMENT										
Type of forest vegetation that will be managed	Forest degradation level			Fire occurrence		Fire periodicity		Fire impact (% burnt)		
	Start	Without	With	Without (y/n)	With (y/n)	Without Year	With Year	Without	With	
Tropical dry forest	Low	Low	Very low	NO	NO	1	1	1.0%	1.0%	
Tropical shrubland	Low	Low	Very low	NO	NO	1	1	1.0%	1.0%	

If the actions proponents want to reflect in terms of how these areas are targeted, are what is described under the core indicator table, e.g. "(1) reducing savanna wildfire emissions through managed fire regimes and (2) preventing conversion of high-carbon soils/biomass in designated "No-Go Zones".", then there should be a mix of the above two options - please see below example for reference; in addition, it should be clarified how in addition to "no-go-zones" establishment the project activities would be expected to address the drivers of deforestation in the targeted landscape (which entails a description of correspondence between project activities and drivers of degradation in the project theory of change).

FOREST DEGRADATION & MANAGEMENT										
Type of forest vegetation that will be managed	Forest degradation level			Fire occurrence		Fire periodicity		Fire impact (% burnt)		
	Start	Without	With	Without (y/n)	With (y/n)	Without Year	With Year	Without	With	
Tropical dry forest	Low	Moderate	Low	NO	NO	1	1	1.0%	1.0%	
Tropical shrubland	Low	Low	Low	YES	YES	1	2	2.0%	1.0%	

In any of the cases above, we would not expect the emission reductions to be above 3MtCO2e. Overall **please clarify how what is computed in the exact sheet and reported in the core indicator table corresponds to specific activities from the project as described in the project's logical framework.** This is not clear.

vii) There is overlap between several core indicator which is not permitted in the RMF: CI 1.2 and 3.2; and 3.3 respectively. (3.2 = 30,000ha, + 3.3 =20,000ha gives 50,000ha, and these 50,000 ha are already accounted for in the 200,000 ha of CI1.2 (which is inflated given the MSP states only half will benefit from the RLE). Please clarify, reconcile and explain.

HF March 2026

a.) i. Please consider moving at least part of values currently under indicator 3.2 (Forest) to 3.3 (natural grass and woodland) as the project's description describes for example Sumba as Savanna. As part of this land is used for grazing and cattle ranching, you may wish to allocate part of the hectares to indicator 3.1.

ii. Please consider entering value, if relevant, under indicator 4.4 under the rationale that the establishment of No-Go Zones might equate to avoiding forest loss, if these zones are recorded as Forest.

iii. Please consider moving all expected emissions reduction under the Direct sub-indicator (6.5). As currently written, no justification is provided to document the broader adoption scenario (Indirect) with related assumptions. Instead, the description of activities leading to GHG emission reduction (fire regime, no-go zones) seem to relate to activities the project will

directly implement.

iv. Please consider moving all expected emissions reduction under the Direct sub-indicator (6.5). As currently written, no justification is provided to document the broader adoption scenario (Indirect) with related assumptions. Instead, the description of activities leading to GHG emission reduction (fire regime, no-go zones) seem to relate to activities the project will directly implement.

v. As the description of Component 3, Outcome 3, Output 3.1, speaks about OECMs, please consider targeting terrestrial OECMs under indicator 4.5.

b.) Given the ambitious core indicator targets, please ensure the the TOC and outcomes clearly indicate how these will be achieved (for example: there is a restoration target, which assumes that restoration activities will occur with co-finance as a result of this GEF project-this needs to be clear in the TOC and results framework).

Agency's Comments

IUCN, May 14 2026

Thank you for the highly constructive feedback on the Core Indicators and EX-ACT calculations. We fully agree with your observations regarding spatial overlap and the need for a highly conservative carbon mitigation estimate.

We have revised the PIF, the Theory of Change diagram, the core indicators sheet, and the accompanying EX-ACT sheet to comprehensively address the points you raised. Below is a summary of the adjustments:

1. We have clarified/adjusted the apparent overlap to comply strictly with the RMF guidelines. The areas are delineated into mutually exclusive zones:

- CI 1 (Protected Areas): Adjusted to 100,000 ha. This accounts strictly for the core "No-Go Zones".
- CI 3 (Restoration): Retained at 50,000 ha (30,000 ha dry forest, 20,000 ha savanna/shrublands). These are actively degraded areas designated as "Restoration Zones," located entirely outside the CI 1 boundaries.
- CI 4 (Improved Practices): Retained at 100,000 ha. This represents multi-use/productive landscapes managed under improved practices, situated outside both CI 1 and CI 3 zones. The narrative beneath the Core Indicators table in the PIF and the Comments section in the CI sheet have been updated to explicitly confirm that these hectares do not overlap. Furthermore, we have added a dedicated paragraph below the Core Indicators table mapping how these specific hectares correspond directly to the project's logical framework (specifically Outputs 3.2 and 3.3).

2. We have revised the EX-ACT sheet. To ensure a highly conservative and defensible estimate, we adopted the mixed approach that was suggested. The EX-ACT calculation now focuses specifically on how the targeted areas are managed:

- 20,000 ha (Savanna/Shrublands): Modeled for reduced wildfire emissions through managed fire regimes (utilizing the fire periodicity and impact columns).
- 30,000 ha (Dry Forests): Modeled for preventing the conversion of high-carbon soils and biomass within designated "No-Go Zones."
- This targeted approach brings our estimated emission reductions down to 2,900,000 tCO₂e, and the PIF Core Indicator table has been updated to match this figure exactly.

3. To clarify how LENTERA tackles the drivers of degradation beyond spatial zoning, we have strengthened the Theory of Change narrative and updated the ToC diagram. We detail how the project's multi-stakeholder forums and regulatory mechanisms directly address land-use conversion, habitat loss, and pollution. By negotiating sustainable grazing quotas, implementing integrated fire management, and managing buffer zones around karst extraction sites, the project ensures that structural drivers are mitigated through community governance and private sector alignment.

IUCN, March 31 2026

a.i. Thank you for the suggestion. We have now moved 20,000 ha to Indicator 3.3 (to represent the savanna ecosystem in Sumba)

a.ii. We opt not to enter the value at this stage (but we can consider it at the PPG phase), given that there will be many assumptions and assessments required to focus on this indicator, e.g. with regards to HCV status as well as recent status of land use, land cover, and legal status changes in the areas.

a.iii. Thank you and well noted on the explanation. We have now moved all to the direct sub-indicator

a.iv. Same as above

a.v. We opt not to include terrestrial OECMs target under indicator 4.5 at this stage, as the government (under coordination of Ministry of Forestry) is still at the early stage of designing the OECMs legal framework, including with the support of GEF-8 CONSERVE). This could be explored further at the PPF phase. Also, to avoid confusion, we edited references about OECMs in the alignment table. The reference to OECM in the table was actually related to the GEF-8 CONSERVE project executed by Ministry of Forestry).

b. This has now been addressed by adding several additional sentences to clarify, for example in the Theory of Change Narrative section as well as in the description of Causal Pathway 3 which is about implementation on the ground and resulting changes that follow.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

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

Secretariat's Comments

HF April 2026

Cleared.

HF March 2026

c.) Noting that displacement may occur and that 'alternative livelihoods' are suggested as a mitigation/compensation of this. Please provide further information in safeguard documents, particularly given the difficulty in doing so, and the potential scale and cost of such livelihood substitutions and sustainability concerns.

Agency's Comments

IUCN, March 31 2026

c. To clarify on the comment, the PIF and screening both refer to the risk of economic displacement occurring through access restrictions to land and resources resulting from the establishment of environmental no-go zones. There is no intention that the project will lead to physical displacement which will be part of an exclusion list. When the full ESMS screening takes place during the PPG phase of the project, there will be careful consideration of this risk, with the option to produce an Access Restriction Action Plan/Process Framework depending on how far sites and their activities are finalised. It is to be noted that in such cases, IUCN policy requires an FPIC process to obtain the consent of affected peoples, and that any livelihood substitution work at minimum results in no net livelihood loss. This is a core approach of IUCN and will be followed with full scrutiny.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

HF April 2026

Cleared.

HF March 2026

The Agency accidentally responded "Yes" to the option "Innovation" - please remove.

Agency's Comments

IUCN, March 31 2026

Thank you very much for your comment. As advised, we have removed the innovation option.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

HF March 2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

HF April 2026

Cleared.

HF March 2026

In Section C please identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and explain HOW.

Agency's Comments
IUCN, March 31 2026

Thank you very much for your comment. A new column in the alignment table has been added, highlighting the linkage with relevant KMGBF targets and explaining how **6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

Secretariat's Comments
HF April 2026

Cleared.

HF March 2026

In Section C please identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and explain HOW.

Agency's Comments
IUCN, March 31 2026

Thank you very much for your comment. A new column in the alignment table has been added, highlighting the linkage with relevant KMGBF targets and explaining how

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments
HF March 2026

Yes.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

HF March 2026

Yes.

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

HF March 2026

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

HF March 2026

Yes.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments
HF March 2026

Yes.

Agency's Comments
8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments
HF March 2026

Yes.

Agency's Comments
Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments
HF April 2026

Cleared.

HF March 2026

Letter of Endorsement include only the Ministry of Environment while in Portal, on top of the Ministry of Environment, the executing partners DIRECTORATE OF SUSTAINABLE NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT, DEPUTY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE AND SUSTAINABLE NATURAL RESOURCES, MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL AGENCY (KLH/BPLH) - please leave only the Ministry of Environment (during preparation stage more organizations could be added as needed).

Agency's Comments
IUCN, March 31 2026

Thank you very much for your comment. As advised, we have removed reference to all other executing partners other than the Ministry of Environment.

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments
HF March 2026

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments
HF March 2026

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

HF April 2026

Cleared. Please note work to be done during PPG in the box below.

HF March 2026

We note that IUCN has attached Preliminary ESMS Screening. An overall ESS risk is classified as Moderate. The Preliminary ESMS Screening said that "[t]he production of Environmental Protection and Management Plans for the three pilot sites will promote environmental no-go-zones, and highlight vulnerable landscapes for restoration. Both scenarios could result in access restrictions for local populations, along with the setting of sustainable grazing regulations." These activities may trigger serious social impacts on Indigenous Peoples and local communities in Sumba, Banggai, and Muna-Buton.

- 1) Please clarify how the project consulted with Indigenous Peoples and local communities in Sumba, Banggai, and Muna-Buton about project concept, particularly related to Component 3, and how the results of the consultations were integrated into the project concept (PIF).
- 2) Please consider Indigenous Peoples and local communities as partners of the project particularly Component 3.
- 3) Please consider integrating Indigenous Peoples and local communities' governance, traditional and local knowledge, capacity building as a part of the project, particularly in Component 3, pilot implementation.

Agency's Comments

IUCN, May 6, 2026

Thank you very much for your clearance and this is duly noted for the PPG phase

IUCN, March 31 2026

1. No IPLCs were consulted during the production of the PIF. It is acknowledged that an accelerated process of consultation must take place during the PPG phase both to cater to environmental and social risk needs, and also to achieve a whole of society approach in project design.

2. This is now referred to in added text on Component 3 in the PIF, to be elaborated in the PPG phase.

This is now referred to in added text on Component 3 in the PIF, to be elaborated in the PPG phase.

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments
HF March 2026

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments
HF March 2026

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

HF 19 May 2026

Yes. PM recommends the MSP PIF for CEO approval. PIF has been technically and OP cleared for approval.

HF May 2026

No, please comprehensively address the issues with the Core Indicator calculations and targets noted in the review sheet. redact yellow highlights from PIF, revise and resubmit for approval. Noting that all GEF-8 projects must be CEO approved prior to June 17th and there will be a presumed project review black out period May 29-June 5, 2026.

HF April 2026

No, not yet. Please address remaining issues (e.g. include core indicator targets in project summary and upload higher resolution TOC), redact yellow highlights from PIF, revise and resubmit for approval.

HF March 2026

No, not yet. Please revise and resubmit. Please note that the final deadline for CEO approval of GEF-8 MSPs (this project included) is June 15th. Final PM/OP recommendation and CEO approval is targeted for **early May** to avoid project GEFSEC review/approval black-out-periods for GEF Assembly taking place late May-early June 2026. Please contact PM with questions.

Agency's Comments

IUCN, May 14 2026

Kindly note that the requested changes have been made as explained in the relevant section above. In addition, as advised all yellow highlights have been removed from the online version of the PIF.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

1.) Please provide further documentation on the global biodiversity significance of project sites/landscapes within the Wallacea hotspot. This typically requires justifying the project's contribution to the persistence of biodiversity components- genes, species, or ecosystems - in relation to their worldwide extent or population size. Proponents are invited to use the Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) standard or other criteria commonly used to identify areas for biodiversity conservation, but other well justified criteria will be accepted with consideration

for the specific project context and data availability. Please provide evidence that either the areas are recorded as KBA or IBAs (or other designations such as Ramsar sites etc) or that the targeted sites meet IBA/KBA criteria and, as relevant, include the related KBA (or other) assessment and registration process as part of the GEF interventions.

- 2.) Please ensure identifying and engaging wide range of stakeholders using target project areas including seasonal and temporary users of the areas during PPG. Please also ensure conducting thorough consultations with key stakeholders and developing robust mitigation measures including alternative livelihoods for key stakeholders including Indigenous Peoples and local communities based on consultations during PPG.
- 3) Please also ensure integrating mitigation measures and environmental and social action plans as a part of project activities (particularly Component 3) with clear budget and timeline during PPG.
- 4) Please ensure the project obtained free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) from Indigenous Peoples about project design during PPG and throughout project implementation and monitoring.
- 5) Please consider incorporating monitoring indicators related to integration of traditional and local governance, traditional and local knowledge and capacity building for Indigenous Peoples and local communities in the project during PPG.
- 6.) Cofinancing: The proposed co-financing consists solely of in-kind government support for recurrent expenditures. While I understand that the main components of the project are TA, there may still be opportunities to mobilize additional co-financing from other sources or through other financial instruments, such as government grants, by the CEO approval stage. At the CEO approval stage, it would be also helpful for the co-financing letter(s) to provide further detail on how the in-kind contributions will be allocated across components, particularly given the relatively substantial amount involved (USD 5.5 million, excluding PMC).

Agency's Comments
IUCN, March 31 2026

Thank you very much for your comments. These are duly noted for the PPG phase.
Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/12/2026	4/1/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/30/2026	5/6/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/8/2026	5/14/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/19/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)		