

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

Review PIF 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

1/28/2021

Review completed by PM

3/9/2021

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

MSP

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

02/16/2021: Clarification requested.

Please clarify if the project includes restoration activities on the ground. If so, the respective focal area objective LD-1-3 would need to be entered in table A as well. This is unclear as the core indicator table does not include targets for restoration, however, table B has outputs on restoration (1.1.1 and 1.1.2).

03/03/2021: Not fully clarified.

Unfortunately, there is still a logical inconsistency in the project design. As presented now, the project has Restoration included in Table A as a focal area objective and in Table B as outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2. However, the project has no targets under core indicator 3. Please decide on one of the following options to make the design consistent:

- If there are no targets under indicator 3, it would be logical that all funding is aligned with LD-1-1 (Sustainable Land Management) and that outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 are renamed as "rehabilitation" through SLM activities.
- If there are targets under indicator 3 commensurate with a \$1.4 million investment, it would be logical that Table A includes LD-1-3 (Forest and Landscape Restoration) and outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 are focusing on "restoration".

03/09/2021: Adequate clarification provided and changes made.

Cleared

Agency Response

03/01/2021: The PIF has been changed and now reads:

Programming Directions	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
LD-1-1	GET	335,730.00	2,440,904.00
LD-1-3	GET	1,439,583.00	13,089,182.00
Total Project Cost (\$)		1,775,313.00	15,530,086.00

03/08/2021

Thank you for the guidance, the targets under indicator 3 and indicator 4 have been aligned:

Indicator 3 Area of land restored ⓘ			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
3697.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural land restored ⓘ			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
3,180.00			

Indicator 3.2 Area of Forest and Forest Land restored ⓘ			
Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
517.00			

and

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas) ⓘ

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
22336.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

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

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
<input type="text"/>			

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares) ⓘ

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
<input type="text"/>			

Type/Name of Third Party Certification




Please list the third party certification standard that has been applied and how many hectares that have been certified under each standard applied.

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems ⓘ

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
22,336.00			

and the figures in table A have been also corrected accordingly to:

A. INDICATIVE FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Programming Directions	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Co-Financing(\$)	
LD-1-1	GET	813,331.00	7,223,437.00	 
LD-1-3	GET	961,982.00	8,306,649.00	 
+ Add New	Total (\$)	1,775,313.00	15,530,086.00	

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

02/16/2021: Clarification requested.

Please see above question on restoration and outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 in Table B.

03/03/2021:

Please see above on outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2. in Table B.

03/09/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

03/01/2021: The PIF has been changed and now reads:

Programming Directions	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
LD-1-1	GET	335,730.00	2,440,904.00
LD-1-3	GET	1,439,583.00	13,089,182.00
Total Project Cost (\$)		1,775,313.00	15,530,086.00

03/08/2021

See agency response provided to point 1 above

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

02/16/2021: Yes.

03/09/2021: ADDITIONAL REVIEW FINDINGS:

1) Co-financing from the Tourism Academy of Majapahit is listed "in-kind" in Table C. Where co-financing meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditure" and not a "investment mobilized" unless there is strong justification to do so.

2) It is also noted that the ratio of PMC co-financing is not proportional to the overall ratio of project co-financing. However, this is accepted by the Program Manager based on the understanding that the indicative total amount of \$1.1 million of PMC financing will be fully sufficient to cover all PMC costs and that no management costs will be charged towards project components at the time of CEO endorsement.

03/24/2021:

1) Addressed in Table C and 2) Acknowledged as per agency response below.

Cleared

Agency Response

03/24/2021:

1) In line with the advice received the in-kind co-financing by the Tourism Agency of Majapahit has been classified as recurrent expenditure

2) It is confirmed that the indicative total amount of PMC financing will be sufficient to cover all PMC costs and no management costs will be charged towards project components at the time of CEO endorsement

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 02/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 02/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 02/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

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 02/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response
Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
02/16/2021: No.

Some core indicators are:

- missing (not all figures mentioned under the table in the explanation section are entered); or
- wrong magnitude is entered. Please enter the full figure not 'million'.
- the entered figures are not in line with the explanation provided under the table. They are also different from the explanation provide din Annex H and entered in different categories.
- there is a figure of 26 ha entered under indicator 5 on marine protected areas? The reviewer assumes that this is incorrect. Please do however check if there are reasonable targets possible for indicator 7 on "Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management" which would be very much in line with the projects activities.

03/03/2021: Not fully.

I note that the target of 26033 ha has been entered under "area of landscapes under sustainable management in production landscapes".

There is one minor adjustment required: For indicator 6 on carbon benefits: Please enter the year of accounting (start year) and duration: 20 years (recommended duration as per GEF guidelines).

03/09/2021: Adjustments made as discussed in box 1 to reflect better alignment with Table A and outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 in Table B. 3,697 ha of the "area under improved management" has been moved to indicator 3: "area under restoration" as the activities to be implemented to improve management are in fact restorative activities.

Cleared

Agency Response

03/01/2021: The PIF has been changed and now reads:

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
26033.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

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

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
26,033.00			

The entry for indicator 5 has been done by mistake and was removed

03/08/2021

The start year of accounting has been inserted as 2023 and the duration has been set to 20 years as per GEF recommendations

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 02/16/2021: 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
02/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
02/16/2021: Yes.

However, figure 3, 4, 5 and 7 are not visible in the portal. Please try to upload again.

03/03/2021: Thank you, all figures are visible now.

Cleared

Agency Response 03/01/2021: All figures have been uploaded again. Yet, to overcome the technical challenges of the GEF portal, an Annex I with all the figures has been prepared and uploaded separately.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

02/16/2021: Yes.

However, please check the Theory of Change figure. It is not visible in the portal. Please upload again and/or upload also as a separate file in documents.

03/03/2021: It is visible now.

Cleared

Agency Response 03/01/2021: The Theory of Change figure has been uploaded again. Yet, to overcome the technical challenges of the GEF portal, an Annex I with all the figures has been prepared and uploaded separately.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

02/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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

02/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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

02/16/2021: Yes.

Please note above comment on core indicators, requesting to correct the entries in line with explanation under the table.

03/03/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response 03/01/2021: entries were corrected

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

02/16/2021: 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

02/16/2021: Yes.

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

02/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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

02/16/2021: Not fully.

While the gender context is provided, it is mostly referring to the overall situation in Indonesia. Please provide some more specific project related information as well as project specific opportunities.

In context of the engagement with the private sector, through these agroforestry ventures, training and extension could be one way of creating more gender equity in the

project. Please explore in this context women's involvement in decision making processes and financial management, for example.

03/03/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

03/01/2021: More specific project related information has been provided and wording has been introduced how the project will be addressing gender inequalities. For this purpose the paras 109 and 110 (highlighted in yellow) have been introduced

Briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).

107. While the benefits of women's participation are well established in Gender, Environment and Development theory, the exclusion of women and other gender-based injustices in forest tenure and forest governance has not been adequately addressed in Indonesia (Siscawati and Mahaningtyas 2012). Compared to men, women have less involvement in decision making processes that define their access to the forest land and resources on which their livelihoods depend (Gurung et al 2011). Increasing women's participation in forest and land resource management has been determined to improve governance, resource allocation and the sustainability of forest resources. Specifically, enhancing women's participation in decision making committees in community forest institutions has been shown to improve forest governance and resource sustainability (Agarwal 2009).

108. A number of gender injustices limit women's involvement in forest governance in Indonesia. Women's roles in the forest sector are invisible and informal, leading to poor working conditions and lower remuneration (World Bank 2009). In many community forestry projects in Indonesia, women are significantly involved in propagation, planting, maintenance, replanting trees, harvesting non-timber forest products (NTFP)² and connecting these products to market. Yet women's participation in the forest farmers groups that form a key forest governance function is non-existent (Gurung et al 2011). Support from government or civil society is necessary to assist women to access markets for NTFP, including information on certification schemes and support to access credit (Marshall, Schreckenber and Newton 2006)[1].

109. In the designated project area (upper reaches of the three catchment areas in rural East Java), most women work in the agricultural sector. While women have played an increasingly important role in development in the project area, they are still vastly underrepresented in governance and decision-making processes at all levels. The gender inequality in access to resources, education and information is most severe among the poor in rural areas. As extension activities are coordinated by agriculture cooperatives and/or farmers' groups, whose members are mostly male heads of households, extension activities and training for women are seldom implemented although women are engaged in agricultural works. Compared with women in urban areas, the standard of living (such as access to safe water and electricity) of women in rural areas is low, and women in rural areas have less access to education and health services, and fewer participate in economic activities and decision-making institutions.

110. To overcome this situation the project through the MOEF as the executing agency and the local NGOs and CSOs that will become engaged at the grass root level will work towards improving women's participation in paid employment and women's access to productive resources and the deep-rooted social barriers to girls' participation in education will be addressed. Women will be empowered politically and economically, which includes being adequately represented at all levels of decision-making. Equal access to and full participation in power structures and involvement in all development efforts as essential for gender equality and sustainable development will be promoted.

111. During the PPG phase UNIDO will implement a gender analysis to confirm the above and identify other critical gender issues. A gender mainstreaming strategy for the project will be developed to assure that critical gender issues will be duly addressed during project implementation as to assure the overcoming of inequities and to promote gender mainstreaming.

112. In support of GEF's Policy on Gender Mainstreaming, the above mentioned gender injustices will be actively countered and gender issues will be mainstreamed in the project at all levels. Fostering a gender perspective within the NGOs/CSOs that will be entrusted with the execution of activities at grassroot level will be an important way to address discrimination and social disparities based on gender differences. Gender mainstreaming in environmental NGOs and CSOs will help to eliminate gender-based disparities. Gender equality will be ensured by granting women representatives priority access to sensitization, training and

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

02/16/2021: Yes. However, please take following suggestions into account as appropriate:

Overall there is excellent representation of the private sector and their roles identified. The multi-stakeholder approach identified in this PIF is supported the GEF's private sector engagement strategy and is consistent with the vision for private sector engagement.

One aspect to consider and document is the metrics that will be used to assess the 'Brewing a Better World' from the private sector perspective. What metrics are they seeking and how well do they align with those of the GEF? Also if these metrics are Heineken's then it would be interesting to compare to AB Inbev, Coca Cola and to see whether there can be alignment on key metrics for business related to water for this sector. This level of detail may be included in the PPG.

- Opportunities throughout Indonesia in the other 14 priority catchments targeted by the government could be further identified as the project evolves. Linkage with the Indonesian division of the Water Stewardship Alliance could also engage further private sector actors and linkage to these other catchments.

- The involvement of Heineken could be a valuable case study (with cross-reference to the project's knowledge management approach). GEF is interested in making such a case study later available to the entire partnership as part of our knowledge management and private sector engagement strategy.

03/03/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

03/01/2021: During the PPG phase a short comparative analysis of the HEINEKEN 'Brewing a better World' sustainability strategy and the equivalent strategies of Coca Cola and ABInBev will be carried out. This analysis will assess how the sustainability strategies of these 3 globally operating corporations will support the achievement of the SDGs, how they relate to the GEF Focal Area Strategies and how the metrics of these sustainability strategies do relate to the GEF Core Indicators.

In 7.3: Potential for scaling-up, para 101, the following sentence has been included:

As the project evolves opportunities in the other 14 priority catchment areas targeted by the government will be identified. This will be done in close cooperation with the MOEF, the Indonesian Division of the Water Stewardship Alliance and the just recently

established Water Resilience Coalition, which has brought together the key Indonesian private sector entities with an interest to engage and cooperate in water stewardship.

In section 8: Knowledge Management the following para has been included as para 154:

154. During the PPG phase UNIDO will prepare a case study on the long history of this project and the complex process that finally led to the development of the PIF. It will also elaborate on the necessary preconditions and the challenges to match the goals of highly committed private sector entities with those of the GEF and partner governments. The purpose will be two to allow other industries to benefit from the lessons learned and to make it available through GEF SEC to the entire partnership as part of GEF SEC's knowledge management and private sector engagement strategy. The case study will also be disseminate through industry round tables as e.g. the Beverage Industries Environmental Round Table and the CEO Water Mandate.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

02/16/2021: Not fully.

Please make the climate risk section in the table more specific to the project. As water stewardship and the related project objectives are closely affected by climate change and drought-related events, the climate risks should be carefully assessed.

Further, it is unclear what is meant when the mitigation measures are "recommended by the World Bank".

03/03/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

03/01/2021: The climate change risk section has been amended and now reads:

<p>Climate Change may result in an increase and the frequency of extreme weather events (heat waves and drought as well as heavy downpours resulting in</p>	<p>Me</p>	<p>Mean annual temperature has increased by about 0.3°C in Indonesia since 1990. Warming will increase by 0.2-0.3°C per decade in Indonesia. Annual precipitation across the majority of the country is predicted to increase. A high population density and rapid industrialization, coupled with the dependence on the country's resource base, make the country vulnerable to projected changes in climate. The eastern provinces of Java are highly vulnerable to multiple climate hazards, including drought.</p>	<p>SUSAN, Christian Deleted-risks:</p>
<p>landslides and flooding</p>	<p>Me</p>	<p>foods, landslides, and sea-level rise—but not cyclones. In Indonesia, 50% of disasters due to climate change during 1998–2018, which were dominated by flooding (30%), heavy windstorm (26%), landslides (22%), and drought (18%). In order to mitigate the climate change risk the following measures will be taken: • For the agroforestry schemes, indigenous tree species with a high wind, drought, and temperature tolerance will be chosen. In the siting of the agroforestry areas particular focus will be put on avoiding sites that are prone to landslides. • For the bamboo afforestation, wind, drought, and temperature resistant varieties will be chosen. In the siting of the bamboo afforestation areas particular focus will be put on avoiding flood and riverbank erosion prone sites. • In the siting of the absorption wells, particular focus will be put on avoiding sites that are prone to landslides and the deposition of surface run-off with high sediment loading.</p>	<p>SUSAN, Christian Deleted: A high population density and rapid industrialization, coupled with the dependence on the country's resource base, make the country vulnerable to projected changes in climate. The eastern provinces of Java are highly vulnerable to multiple climate hazards, including drought, floods, landslides, and sea-level rise—but not cyclones. SUSAN, Christian Deleted: The WORLD-BANK RECOMMENDATIONS: IMPROVED FARMING PRACTICES, PUBLIC AWARENESS-RAISING CAMPAIGNS ON CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS AND ADAPTATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS AND POLICIES AIMED AT REDUCING DEFORESTATION AND PROTECTING FORESTS, AS MEASURES TO REDUCE CLIMATE RISK IN THE AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND WATER SECTOR. WHILE THE IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE MIGHT REACH A CRITICAL THRESHOLD WHICH SIGNIFICANTLY CHANGE THE PRECIPITATION PATTERNS AND TEMPERATURE IN THE PROJECT AREA, THIS RISK CAN BE MITIGATED BY CAREFULLY SELECTING TREE SPECIES WHICH ARE ADAPTED TO THE EXPECTED IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE IN INDONESIA AND BY STRENGTHENING THE MOEF'S INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES FOR CONTINUOUS ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.</p>
<p>Climate Change may result in an increase and the frequency of extreme weather events (heat waves and drought as well as heavy downpours resulting in</p>	<p>Me</p>	<p>The outbreak of the global COVID-19 pandemics will have multiple repercussions on the implementation/execution of this project. a- Until a vaccine can be found and made available to a larger part of the Indonesian population the periodic re-instatement of containment measures must be expected. This risk can be mitigated by making the necessary provisions to deliver all capacity building and training measures virtually. With the institutional set-up proposed for this project (e.g. the strong involvement of the MOEF as the executing agency and the execution of grassroot activities by NGOs/CSOs already active in the project</p>	<p>SUSAN, Christian Deleted-risks:</p>
<p>landslides and flooding</p>	<p>Me</p>	<p>foods, landslides, and sea-level rise—but not cyclones. In Indonesia, 50% of disasters due to climate change during 1998–2018, which were dominated by flooding (30%), heavy windstorm (26%), landslides (22%), and drought (18%). In order to mitigate the climate change risk the following measures will be taken: • For the agroforestry schemes, indigenous tree species with a high wind, drought, and temperature tolerance will be chosen. In the siting of the agroforestry areas particular focus will be put on avoiding sites that are prone to landslides. • For the bamboo afforestation, wind, drought, and temperature resistant varieties will be chosen. In the siting of the bamboo afforestation areas particular focus will be put on avoiding flood and riverbank erosion prone sites. • In the siting of the absorption wells, particular focus will be put on avoiding sites that are prone to landslides and the deposition of surface run-off with high sediment loading.</p>	<p>SUSAN, Christian Deleted: A high population density and rapid industrialization, coupled with the dependence on the country's resource base, make the country vulnerable to projected changes in climate. The eastern provinces of Java are highly vulnerable to multiple climate hazards, including drought, floods, landslides, and sea-level rise—but not cyclones. SUSAN, Christian Deleted: The WORLD-BANK RECOMMENDATIONS: IMPROVED FARMING PRACTICES, PUBLIC AWARENESS-RAISING CAMPAIGNS ON CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS AND ADAPTATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS AND POLICIES AIMED AT REDUCING DEFORESTATION AND PROTECTING FORESTS, AS MEASURES TO REDUCE CLIMATE RISK IN THE AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND WATER SECTOR. WHILE THE IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE MIGHT REACH A CRITICAL THRESHOLD WHICH SIGNIFICANTLY CHANGE THE PRECIPITATION PATTERNS AND TEMPERATURE IN THE PROJECT AREA, THIS RISK CAN BE MITIGATED BY CAREFULLY SELECTING TREE SPECIES WHICH ARE ADAPTED TO THE EXPECTED IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE IN INDONESIA AND BY STRENGTHENING THE MOEF'S INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES FOR CONTINUOUS ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT.</p>
<p>Climate Change may result in an increase and the frequency of extreme weather events (heat waves and drought as well as heavy downpours resulting in</p>	<p>Me</p>	<p>The outbreak of the global COVID-19 pandemics will have multiple repercussions on the implementation/execution of this project. a- Until a vaccine can be found and made available to a larger part of the Indonesian population the periodic re-instatement of containment measures must be expected. This risk can be mitigated by making the necessary provisions to deliver all capacity building and training measures virtually. With the institutional set-up proposed for this project (e.g. the strong involvement of the MOEF as the executing agency and the execution of grassroot activities by NGOs/CSOs already active in the project</p>	<p>SUSAN, Christian Deleted-risks:</p>

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

02/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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

02/16/2021: 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

02/16/2021: Not fully.

The section is rather generic. Please explain if the project is based on any lessons learned of previous projects and initiatives. Further elaborate on how the KM approach is planned to be developed during the PPG, especially with regard to private sector involvement as an innovative element of the project.

03/03/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

03/01/2021: The PIF has been amended and the following paras have been included to section 8: Knowledge Management:

153 The project is based on lessons learned from comparative initiatives e.g. the Monterey Water funds that the creation of a shared understanding of the underlying reasons for water scarcity, the creation of a commonly accepted vision the participatory identification of priority measures and the creation of a multi stakeholder alliance are crucial elements for any environmental stewardship activity. The project is innovative insofar as these processes were catalyzed by a single private sector entity that was willing to bear the transaction costs and to engage a UN entity as a neutral broker in working with stakeholders from government, civil society, academia and other private sector entities in this process.

See above under box 4).

154 . During the PPG phase UNIDO will prepare a case study on the long history of this project and the complex process that finally led to the development of the project document. It will also elaborate on the necessary preconditions and the challenges to match the goals of highly committed private sector entities with those of the GEF and partner governments. The purpose will be two to allow other industries to benefit from the lessons learned and to make it available through GEF SEC to the entire partnership as part of GEF SEC's knowledge management and private sector engagement strategy. The case study will also be disseminated through industry round tables as e.g. the Beverage Industries Environmental Round Table and the CEO Water Mandate.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

02/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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

02/16/2021: Yes.

OFP endorsement letter filed in documents.

Agency Response

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

n/a

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

02/16/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

03/03/2021: No. Minor corrections requested in Table A, B, and the core indicators table.

03/09/2021: No. Please address additional review findings on co-financing (box 3).

03/24/2021: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO PIF approval of the MSP.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	2/16/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/3/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/9/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/24/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The project is designed to 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 mitigation measures are in place. Nevertheless, 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.