

Management of Indonesian and Timor-Leste Transboundary Watersheds (MITLTW)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10679

Countries

Regional (Indonesia, Timor Leste)

Project Name

Management of Indonesian and Timor-Leste Transboundary Watersheds (MITLTW)

Agencies

CI

Date received by PM

9/28/2020

Review completed by PM

10/28/2020

Program Manager

Christian Severin

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly, please explain what the connectivity is between the river basins proposed for formulating TDA/SAPs for. If no direct linkages, it may be advisable to focus on one transboundary basin

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF Agency 10/15/2020:

Terminology adjusted throughout the PIF for clarity. The fact that the two focal basins are not hydrologically is explicitly acknowledged, but the project proponents strongly believe that this opportunity to advance management in these two basins will enormously benefit prospects for eventual joint management of all 10 transboundary watersheds shared by the two countries.

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

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): No. Please add following to the Table B:

- 1) It is not clear from the description what the geographical/hydrological connection is between the two river basins, that are proposed as laying the foundation for a TDA/SAP. A question to be answered is if this proposed investment will focus on a river basin(s) or a region.
- 2) Please recall that a TDA is a science based assessment and identification of transboundary concerns/stressors to be addressed through a Strategic Action Programme. The SAP lays out the different solutions to address transboundary issues
- 3) Will project be delivering one TDA/SAP or multiple?? if the latter what is the anticipated outcome to be achieved
- 4) Please include the establishment of a transboundary datasharing mechanism as part component 1 outputs.
- 5) The SAP is to be ultimately signed of at ministerial level, please make that adjustment to table B output 2.2.4

6) Transboundary forestry entities are mentioned as being the primary agencies for transboundary water management. Please ensure that ministries in charge of water management will also be involved.

7) Please reformulate output indicators so that they become more quantifiable.

8) please ensure that the TDA and SAP activities and associated output indicators also reflect upon the aquifers underlying the river basin(s).

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

30th of October 2020 (cseverin); Partly, please address following points:

1) please make sure that the title of the project included in the LOEs, is also the title of the project in the portal.

2) Please ensure that the executing partners included in the portal, is equivalent to the executing partners identified in the LOEs.

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF 10/30/2020:

1. The LOE from Indonesia matches the title in the project (this is the final title). We received the LOE from Timor-Leste back in September before the title was updated. We can include an updated LOE during the PPG phase from Timor-Leste with the updated title.

2. Executing partners in the PIF now align with the partners from the LOEs.

CI-GEF Agency 10/15/2020:

1) Adjustments made to clarify terminology, and to make explicit that the project will undertake TDA and SAP at the drainage system level (set of 5 watersheds/basins), and produce 2 SAP sub-plans, one for each focal basin.

2) Noted.

3) As mentioned above: 1 TDA/SAP, with 2 SAP sub-plans

4) Added to Output 1.2.4, which now reads:

Output 1.2.4: Structures and systems set up and operational policies and a manual developed, including a transboundary datasharing mechanism, for the JFWG and for the community task forces to enable transboundary watershed management in the Loes/Talau and Mota/Masin basins.

5) Output 2.2.4 adjusted to read:

Output 2.2.4: SAP and SAP sub-plans endorsed at Ministerial level.

6) This relates to the Joint Forestry Working Group. The JFWG was set up to represent both countries and oversee day-to-day management of joint watersheds between the two countries, housed within their designated technical ministries (MOEF and MAF). In Indonesia, Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MOEF) Directorate General for Watershed and Protected Forest Management is the technical and supporting agency. In Timor-Leste, the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF) Directorate General for Forestry, Coffee and Industrial Plants handles coordinating and technical functions of transboundary watershed management. Thus, the relevant ministries in charge of water management are certainly involved. A footnote has been added to Table B to preempt the question here.

7) Indicators have been added to the outputs as requested.

8) Explicit references to aquifer conditions inserted.

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

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, the co-financing seems to consist of internal parallel co-financing only. No national, local or private cofinancing has been identified. Finally, the amount of co-financing identified is considered way to low considering the proposed investment.

The cofinancing amount and its composition needs to FULL review considerable changes made to it.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): please address above comments

28th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly.

1) Please ensure that the Cofinancing allocated to the Project management is equivalent to the ratio between GEF/Cofinancing for the overall project.

2) Please note, that it is understood that cofinancing will be further elaborated during PPG and hence will increase considerable.

28th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF Agency 10/28/2020:

Co-financing for PMC updated

CI-GEF Agency 10/27/2020: co-financing amounts updated. However, co-financing from Indonesia and project partners will be included during the PPG phase.

CI-GEF Agency 10/15/2020:

Pending

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 5th of October 2020 (cseverin):yes

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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 5th of October 2020 (cseverin):Yes

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 5th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

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

5th of October 2020 (cseverin):Partly. Based on the project description, this investment is not about lake basins, nor is it about SAP implementation, but SAP formulation. Please make these adjustments.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Please add SAP formulation as requested above, which in taxonomy is bundled with SAP preparation - Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan preparation

28th of October 2020 (cseverin): In the taxonomy sheet on the GEF website, following wording has been included "Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan preparation". We will work towards ensuring coherency between the two documents.

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): Please make sure to make this update during PPG phase.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 10/23/2020:

Note that in the agency view in the portal TDA and SAP preparation is not a selection; it's TDA only. The worksheet (word document includes this selection). See

Global Environment Facility (GEF) Portal

Duration* 60 In Months

Agency Fee (\$) \$ 449,959

Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Gender Mainstreaming, Women groups, Gender-sensitive indicators, Sex-disaggregated indicators

14 options selected

- Extractive Industries
- Forestry - Including HCVF and REDD+
- International Waters
 - Fisheries
- Biomes
 - Constructed Wetlands
 - Polar Ecosystems
 - Mangrove
 - Coral Reefs
 - Seagrasses
- Strategic Action Plan Implementation
- Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis
- Pollution
 - Plastics
 - Nutrient pollution from Wastewater
 - Persistent toxic substances
 - Nutrient pollution from all sectors except wastewater
- Coastal
- Freshwater
 - Lake Basin
 - Aquifer

A. INDICATIVE FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Programming Directions	Trust Fund	GEF Project	Total (\$)
IW-3-6	GET		
Total (\$)			4,999,541.00
			12,322,134.00

Page 5 of 6 | 1 of 786 words | English (United States)

screen shot.

CI-GEF Agency 10/15/2020:

Taxonomy updated

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

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly. As indicated under initial review comment, it is unclear what the geographical and hydrological connection is between the two river basins that are to potentially be target by this investment. When this is more clear, it will also be easier to identify if the write up describes the needed barriers.

21st of October 2020 (Cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF Agency 10/15/2020:

Adjustments made to clarify terminology, and to make explicit that the project will undertake TDA and SAP at the drainage system level (set of 5 watersheds/basins), and produce 2 SAP sub-plans, one for each focal basin.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): The Baseline description seems to be mixing incremental reasoning and description of the existing baseline that the project will be building on.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF Agency 10/15/2020:

Text that is more suitable for the incremental reasoning section has been moved.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly, please include a narrative to accompany the illustration of the Theory of Change

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF Agency 10/15/2020:

Narrative on theory of change included (see text below)

The set of outcomes described above and their corresponding output reflect the following Theory of Change, as represented in the figure below:

The Theory of Change for this project holds that if a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) is completed for the Loes/Motamasin watershed; a Strategic Action Plan (SAP) is developed on the basis of the TDA, with sub-plans for the Loes/Talau and Mota/Masin catchments; priority interventions are selected from the SAP and piloted in the two catchments; and adaptive management takes place on the basis of effective monitoring and evaluation; then a transboundary management entity can be set up and begin work on the basis of shared management plans, using best practice and learnings derived from the TDA work, from

other efforts around the world (e.g. through IW:Learn), and from knowledge generated through implementation of field activities. This will result in robust transboundary water management, enhanced food, water and livelihood security for 366,000 beneficiaries, and a clear path for scale-up to the entirety of the Loes/Motamasin watershed and replication in other transboundary contexts around the world. The global environmental benefits of these results include improved water supplies, reduced risk of floods, droughts, landslides, reduced erosion and sedimentation, and habitat/ecosystem maintenance.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, proposed activities seems to aligned with the GEF 7 IW strategy, but please ensure to clarify what project is focused on delivering and for what river basins.

Agency Response

CI-GEF Agency 10/15/2020:

Adjustments have been made throughout the PIF to better demonstrate alignment

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

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): 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

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, the description included focused on BD and LD GEBs, but totally omits the GEB of transboundary freshwater cooperation. Since the project is proposing to utilize IW funding, please add IW GEBs. No need to remove additional GEBs that is anticipated to be achieved, but do make sure to add IW GEBs

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF Agency 10/15/2020:

Added the following text:

The MITLTW project relates to the third Objective under the International Waters Focal Area (enhancing water security in freshwater ecosystems), particularly as realized through regional and national investments in the regionally endorsed cooperative frameworks such as SAPs. As noted in GEF-7 Programming Directions, this aligns with the emphasis on transboundary cooperation in SDG Target 6.5, in particular Indicator 6.5.2 (proportion of transboundary basin area within a country covered by an operational arrangement for water cooperation). To these ends, the project will contribute to enhanced quality, coverage and free availability of robust data and information on surface and groundwater availability and use, natural resources, and related grey and green infrastructure assets and adaptation deficits; capacity to use this data to inform strategic planning and management; and dialogue between Indonesia and Timor-Leste to use this data for joint decision-making and management action, guided by a transboundary SAP. Shared ecosystem services will thus provide a basis for enhanced cooperation and peaceful relations between the two countries, while supporting water, food, energy and environmental security.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, as this is to be the first transboundary water cooperation investment between Indonesia and Timor Leste, the investment will offer multiple different avenues for upscaling and leading to sustainable development.

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

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): yes, however, please include a map that more clearly illustrates the connectivity between the two basins.

Agency Response

CI-GEF Agency 10/15/2020:

A clearer map of the transboundary watershed management geography is not publicly available. The Map of Transboundary Aquifers of the World available on the UNESCO-IHP site includes a shared aquifer, labeled AS156, but provides only a location indicator, no delimitation (see link here). A priority for the partners during the PPG phase will be to procure or prepare better maps of the project area.

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

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): 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

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly. Please as a minimum ensure that the project will be delivering to the different categories of the gender responsive measures. Especially relevant seems **improving women's participation and decision-making; and generating socio-economic benefits or services for women**, considering this is a TDA/SAP project investment. If additional information is available on Gender perspectives of the project please include these.

Further, it will be essential that the project proponents work diligently in elaborating on the gender perspectives during the ppg phase. The gender section included in the pif submission is barely providing enough information on relevant gender dimensions related to the project context or components.

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed adequately at this point, but it is understood that serious efforts need to be undertaken on the GENDER mainstreaming and gender perspectives of the investment during PPG phase, in order for this project to be CEO endorsed. Considering the importance of ensuring the broadest stakeholder consultation in a process that is developing a TDA/SAP, gender analysis and activities in general need to be undertaken early in the PPG phase to ensure that activities are properly informed by the findings.

Agency Response

10/30/2020:

The project has selected the relevant gender indicators (all 3). At the moment, there isn't any additional information on gender perspectives. However, this will be included in the gender analysis submitted at CEO endorsement. The relevant gender dimensions will be included in the gender analysis.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, however, please ensure that private sector engagement will happen throughout the TDA/SAP process as possible, to ensure private sector and natural resource users are part of setting the priorities.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 10/15/2020:

Adjusted text in private sector engagement section to read:

The private sector will therefore be included in helping to define and clarify various user needs and priorities, and the results they expect from this work as a beneficiary group, and the project will ensure that they are represented in key dialogues and discussions throughout the TDA and SAP development processes.

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

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly, the PIF includes a risk matrix that outlines a number of risks and mitigation measures. However Please undertake a more thorough climate risk screening. GEF STAP provides some guidance on what such a screening may entail.

Considering the impact that COVID 19 have had on most, if not all, global processes, it seems less credible that the project does not foresee any major impacts on either short nor long term. Please, take a careful look at the included COVID impact analysis.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF Agency 10/15/2020:

Climate risk screening has been expanded. A detailed climate vulnerability assessment will be completed during the PPG Phase and risk management options will be identified and incorporated into the design of the project.

Several adjustments made to the COVID 19 section, to signal acknowledgment of possible impacts.

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

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): 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

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): 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

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): Partly, please include specific wording alluding to the fact that the project will allocate a minimum of 1% of the GEF grant towards supporting the investment's participation in IWLEARN activities. Further, please also add the fact that the project will be delivering atleast 2 experience notes and 1 results note during its implementation.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF Agency 10/15/2020:

Specific wording has been included.

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

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): 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

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): Please make sure to upload all LOEs

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): Please upload both LOEs

28th of October 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 10/27/202): LOE from Indonesia now included

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address comments.

21st of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address comments

28th of October 2020 (cseverin): No, please address comments and resubmit ASAP

28th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes, PIF is recommended for technical clearance

30th of October 2020 (cseverin): Yes PIF is recommended for Technical Clearance

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
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The Loes/Motamasin drainage system, totaling 466,582 ha, is the largest of two major transboundary drainage systems shared between Timor-Leste and Indonesia on the Island of Timor. It contains five basins that flow directly into the marine ecosystems of Timor-Leste and Indonesia. The Talau/Loes and Mota Masin basins straddle the greatest portion of lands along the border between Indonesia and Timor-Leste.

Substantial data and information are available for the Talau/Loes basin, and the two areas offer opportunities to plan land-to-coast-to-sea management for both sides of Timor island. Although the two basins are not hydrologically linked, they are part of the same overarching hydrological management unit designated by both country governments, and by intervening in both the project will provide a strong foundation for replication and scale up to eventually encompass all transboundary watersheds between Indonesia and Timor-Leste.

The Management of Indonesian and Timor-Leste Transboundary Watersheds (MITLTW) project will enhance joint watershed management as well as food, water and livelihood security for communities in the Loes/Mota Masin drainage system, one of the two major drainage systems crossing the border between the two countries. This will include conducting a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA), formulating a Strategic Action Plan (SAP) and two basin sub-plans, and working with communities to field test SAP sub-plan recommendations. The project will share lessons learned and put in place conditions required to scale up and benefit the larger Loes/Mota Masin ecosystem and drainage system.

