

Maintaining and Enhancing Water Yield through Land and Forest Rehabilitation (MEWLAFOR)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10757
Countries

Indonesia
Project Name

Maintaining and Enhancing Water Yield through Land and Forest Rehabilitation (MEWLAFOR)
Agencies

UNIDO
Date received by PM

11/26/2021
Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel
Focal Area

Land Degradation **Project Type** MSP 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 12/08/2021: Yes. Cleared Agency Response **Project description summary** 2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document? Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12/08/2021: Yes. Cleared Agency Response 3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

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 12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response
GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12/08/2021: Yes.

However, the detailed budget proposal and its cost effectiveness could not be fully assessed due to the format in which it is presented.

The provided budget table does not allow us to assess whether the different budget lines are adequately charged to the three sources from which the project?s expenditures can be paid (project?s components, M&E, PMC). Please provide the budget in line with the GEF budget template as per GEF guidelines. (Note that in the GEF format it is not necessary to disaggregate per outputs as it makes the table too wide to fit within the margins in Annex E of the CEO Endorsement portal view. The expenditures can be reported per component, not per output.)

12/23/2021: Addressed.

Agency Response 12/21/2021

The budget has been revised and uploaded in the template provided by GEF SEC. In Annex P) the agency project document has been uploaded. It contains the CEO endorsement document with all the annexes and the budget in the GEF SEC template as well as the UNIDO format.

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 12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

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 12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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 12/08/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/08/2021: Yes.

Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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 12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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 12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

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

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 12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response
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 12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

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 12/08/2021: Yes.

GEFSEC welcomes the approach of building the private sector into the consultations from the concept origination of the project and linking to corporate goals and targets (from the comparative analysis of the major company programs/commitments) within the needs at the local landscapes / watershed.

The process of building from existing corporate investment through the Aliansi Air partnership has also contributed to a robust project baseline and enhanced the continuity of efforts, rather than a re-set or start from scratch approach. The inclusion of IBCSD and the Alliance for Water Stewardship will help in creating broader alliances to promote environmental objectives and through convening multi-stakeholder alliances?to develop, harmonize and implement sustainable practices beyond the Brantas river basin. It is also evident that there has been a concerted effort to engage smallholders and to demonstrate the financial viability of forest restoration.

GEFSEC also notes the case study which explores the necessary preconditions and the challenges to match the goals of highly-committed private sector entities with those of the GEF and partner governments, which will be a valuable resource for the GEF partnership in the GEF-8 cycle.

During project implementation, some further consideration could be made to include private sector finance actors that may be able to support smallholders or project outcomes with sustainable financial products or provide such services as group finance or insurance coverage linked to sustainable land management practices.

Cleared

Agency Response 12/21/2021:

During project implementation the possibility to include some further private sector actors that may be able to support smallholders or project outcomes with sustainable financial products or to provide such services as group finance or insurance coverage linked to sustainable land management practices will be assessed.

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 12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response 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 12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response
Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

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 12/08/2021: Yes.

Agency Response
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

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 12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

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 12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/08/2021: No.

1) The reviewer could not locate a agency project document. If the idea is that the GEF template is used as the agency project document, it still needs to be a separate document

that contains all the necessary information including all Annexes and is uploaded to the

portal as a public document.

2) Please note above comment on the budget table and provide accordingly.

12/23/2021: Addressed

Cleared

Agency Response

12/21/2021:

In Annex P) the agency project document has been uploaded. It contains the CEO endorsement document with all the annexes and the budget in the GEF SEC template as well as the UNIDO format. This can be used as a public document.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/08/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/08/2021: GEFSEC comments provided at PIF stage have all been adequately

responded to.

Agency	Response
Council c	omments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a for an MSP

Agency Response STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a for an MSP

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12/08/2021: Has been provided in Annex C.

Cleared

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

21/08/2021: Have been provided.

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

n/a

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 n/a

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 n/a

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/08/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

12/23/2021: Yes. Program manager recommends CEO approval of this MSP (2nd step).

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

First Review	12/8/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/23/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The project will assist the Government of Indonesia to improve its program in community-based restoration of degraded land ecosystems by involving the private sector through public private partnerships and the development of environmental service schemes carried out in priority sub-watersheds of the Brantas River in East Java. The project also aims at strengthening institutions at all levels (community, district / city, provincial, and national), coordination and collaboration across sectors and regions as required for an upscaling of public private partnerships for environmental stewardship and a better enforcement of the regulatory framework to avoid the loss of protected and conservation forests in Indonesia. Stakeholder engagement is led by Aliansi Air, which is a multi-stakeholder alliance catalyzed by industries with an exemplary engagement in sustainability issues that has been successful in establishing cooperative relationships and promoting transformational changes with state institutions, private sector, academia and civil society. The project is fully aligned with the GEF LD Focal Area strategy in GEF 7 to promote private sector engagement and is building on private sector financed pilot activities and will further harness private capital and expertise for finance investments in sustainable land management. The private sector entities involved will also provide technical assistance for smallholders for the marketing of sustainably farmed non timber agroforestry products and of value added bamboo products. The project will result in a wide range of socio-economic benefits as well as global environmental benefits: in total 278,600 people (153,230 male and 125,370 female) will benefit from the project. By putting 3,697 ha of landscapes in forest buffer zones under

improved management practices the loss of 2,407 ha of protected forests and 19,929 ha of conservation forests will be avoided.

COVID-19 implications have been taken into account and adaptive mitigation measures are in place. Further, the pandemic has been assessed as an opportunity to showcase the benefits of the proposed nature based solutions, which will restore the ecological functionality and the provisioning and regulating eco-system services of forests. This will not only mitigate land degradation induced water scarcity but will also increase the resilience of ecological and socio-economic systems to potential future pandemics. The main contribution of this project to a green recovery will be to secure water supply for people and businesses, and the promotion of sustainable NBS business practices.