

Strengthening Capacities for Management of Invasive Alien Species (SMIAS) in Indonesia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10705

Countries

Indonesia

Project Name

Strengthening Capacities for Management of Invasive Alien Species (SMIAS)
in Indonesia

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

3/31/2022

Review completed by PM

5/19/2022

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

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

4/24/2022

Yes.

The PM approved the request by the agency to revise the project title to keep it shorter. We note that, in line with IUCN definitions for IAS, "management" in the new proposed project title is inclusive of actions from prevention to control to eradication across scales.

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

4/24/2022

Yes.

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 NA

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

4/24/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/24/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

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

4/24/2022

Yes.

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

4/24/2022

Yes.

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

4/24/2022

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

4/24/2022

Yes.

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

5/6/2022

Yes. Please carefully examine the best path forward including the costs of maintenance. Many of the shortcomings noted could be addressed by using an existing app managed by another organization rather than something specific to this project. Coordination with other initiatives (GEF funded and others) will be key to deliver the most value with limited resources.

4/24/2022

No, please address the following:

- Creation of an app - The project proposes the creation of a new app. However, it does not appear that there are adequate resources for this activity to do it well and maintain it after the project. We strongly suggest exploring partnerships with existing apps and/or platforms such that the project could support a dashboard/portal/etc and the translation necessary but doesn't not require constant on-going updating with new operating systems and other issues.

Agency Response

RE 4/24/2022

Section 3) *Alternative scenario* in the CEO ER has been revised accordingly to make clear that the project will not create a new mobile app, but will rather work with existing apps (see Output 3.1.3 description, p. 52-53 of the ProDoc). Linkages will be sought with existing apps at the national and global levels, including the one developed under the FORIS project and FAO's FAMEWS app.

A mobile app which included descriptions and images of 50 invasive alien plant species was developed during the previous FORIS Project. This was largely based on the Field Guide that was developed during the Project. However, extensive use has been hampered due to a number of shortcomings which were identified post-project and which the SMIAS Project would work to address, including a need to make it more interactive. This will also be linked to the project's education outreach, to raise awareness of the service. Additionally, FAO has developed several digital tools that the project is looking to build upon, including the FAW Monitoring and Early Warning System (FAMEWS) for the real-time global monitoring of the Fall Armyworm (FAW), eLocust and related apps.^[1] Discussions are currently ongoing with relevant technical and IT app development colleagues.

Activity under Output 3.1.3 has been revised as follows: "Develop/enhance existing mobile phone app, agree on long-term maintenance beyond the project's lifetime, and promote its use." Details will be elaborated during project implementation. It is

anticipated that the scope of the app will be limited to information on the identification and management of the target species (without feedback loop/inputs by users), but this will be confirmed during implementation.

In this regard, the project will also exchange with other relevant GEF projects and initiatives, such as (1) the "Enhancing integrated sustainable management to safeguard Samoa's natural resources" (GEF ID 10410), which plans to develop an IAS information system with public interface; and (2) the "Preventing COSTS of Invasive Alien Species (IAS) in Barbados and the OECS Countries" (GEF ID 9408) which is developing a regional IAS App to create awareness on IAS and aid national efforts in terms of prevention and EDRR.

^[1] <https://www.fao.org/digital-agriculture/digital-portfolio/en/>

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/24/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/24/2022

Yes.

Agency 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

4/24/2022

Yes.

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

4/24/2022

Yes.

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

4/24/2022

Yes.

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

NA

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

4/24/2022

Yes, we welcome the strong recognition of FPIC and indigenous rights in the context of this project noting that IAS can also threaten indigenous livelihoods, culture and traditions.

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

4/24/2022

Yes.

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

4/24/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

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

5/6/2022

Yes. Thank you for the clarification that only biocontrols that have been used successfully in other places (including other areas of Indonesia will be used).

4/24/2022

No, while the general risk information has been included and is fine, the use of biocontrols presents a potential very significant risk and requires very careful examination for each case. Please include information on how this risk will be managed in the main text on the component as well.

Agency Response

RE 4/24/2022

Yes, we concur that there is a risk associated with any control intervention, be it physical, chemical, biological or even cultural control. As such due care, consultation and diligence will be taken prior to the introduction and release of any biological control agent. It should be noted that weed biological control, which has been practiced for over 100 years, has an excellent track record with the release of more than 469 species of control agents against 175 species of non-native target weeds in over 90 countries. Many peer-reviewed articles have demonstrated that it is one of the most cost-effective and safest control interventions to use as a part of a holistic invasive alien plant management strategy. Information on the management of the potential risks associated with biocontrol has been added in Section 3) *Alternative scenario*, Output 1.1.1 (p. 44-45 of the ProDoc) and Output 2.1.2 (p. 48 of ProDoc) description, in line with the measures outlined in the Risks section, as follows:

? Output 1.1.1: As noted in Section ?Environmental and Social risks from the project? (Section 5.b of the ProDoc), any biocontrol agents selected for introduction and possible release must be tested to ensure that they are host specific and pose no threat to crops, native and indigenous plants. An environment risk assessment will be conducted before the release of any biocontrol agent. Additionally, the Project will make sure that Government support is available for implementation of biological control. The project would only introduce biocontrol agents if appropriate and approved, as part of integrated IAS management. This would be done only after initial assessment carried out that determines whether biocontrol is appropriate and feasible. Given the Project?s defined resources and timeline, no agents will be sourced directly from the country of origin of the target IAPS. In other words, there will be no surveys for new potential agents for targeted IAPS. Only those IAPS for which there are known, tested, and established agents that have been officially released elsewhere in the world will be targeted for biocontrol. These are commonly known as ?off-the-shelf? agents. Some agents have been previously released and have established in parts of Indonesia ? these can also be

considered for redistribution if the target species are present and EIA/related due diligence confirms their possible introduction in the Project landscapes. All agents selected and approved for introduction by communities, PA management, and other relevant stakeholders will be imported following all of the required regulatory procedures. These are being reviewed under Component 1 ? the revised procedures/protocols could be tested during the project period. FAO's guide on classical biological control[1] also provides guidance on how to mitigate potential risks of introduction of biological control agents. Also, support for biocontrol will need to be gleaned from all community members, including Masyarakat Adat, residing in the Project landscapes.

Output 2.1.2: As noted above and in Section ?Environmental and Social risks from the project? (Section 5.b of the ProDoc), any biocontrol agents selected for introduction and possible release must be tested to ensure that they are host specific and pose no threat to crops or indigenous plants. An environment risk assessment will be conducted before the release of any biocontrol agent. Additionally, the Project will make sure that Government support is available for implementation of biological control. The project would only introduce biocontrol agents if appropriate and approved, as part of integrated IAS management. This would be done only after initial assessment carried out that determines whether biocontrol is appropriate and feasible. Moreover, support for biocontrol will need to be gleaned from all community members, including Masyarakat Adat, residing in the Project landscapes.

[1] <https://www.fao.org/3/ca3677en/CA3677EN.pdf> (see Figure 1 explaining the classical biocontrol process).

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
4/24/2022

Yes.

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

5/6/2022

Yes.

4/24/2022

No, please discuss coordination with other IAS initiatives outside of Indonesia such as projects with SPREP and others. The PES approach has the potential to yield interesting results and options addressing one of the fundamental challenges of IAS management, cost, and it will be important to share the results.

Agency Response

RE 4/24/2022

Information on relevant regional and global initiatives has been added in *Section 7. Consistency with National Priorities* and *Section 6.b Coordination* of the CEO ER (p. 100-101 of the ProDoc), as follows:

The Project is well cognizant of and has incorporated many of the lessons learnt from previous and ongoing IAS projects in Africa, Asia, Caribbean and the Pacific. The SMIAS Project will coordinate and exchange with, among others, the following regional and global initiatives:

- 1) GEF-6 UNEP ?Preventing COSTS of Invasive Alien Species (IAS) in Barbados and the OECS Countries? (GEF ID 9408);
- 2) GEF-6 UNEP ?Enhancing sustainability of Protected Area systems in Malawi, and stabilizing agro-production in adjoining areas through improved IAS management? (GEF ID 9539);
- 3) GEF-5 UNEP ?Support to the Integrated Program for the Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Socotra Archipelago? (GEF ID 5347); and
- 4) GEF-6 UNEP ?Reduce the threats from Invasive Alien Species (IAS) to terrestrial, freshwater and marine biodiversity in the Pacific by developing and implementing comprehensive national and regional IAS management frameworks? (GEF ID 9410), a project which is being led by the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) and the Pacific Community (SPC)[1].

The proposed Project will also support ongoing work on IAS being undertaken by the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity[2]. Results from the SMIAS project, such as its proposed PES approach, will be shared with these initiatives, and vice versa. For example, South Africa has experience with the use of water levies to raise funds for the management of invasive alien plants in water catchments.

[1] <https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/9410> and <https://www.sprep.org/gef6-rip>

^[2] <https://asean.chm-cbd.net/documents/invasive-alien-species-keeping-intruders-out>
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
4/24/2022

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
4/24/2022

Yes, it will be important to pay particular attention to the risks related to biocontrols.

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
4/24/2022

Yes.

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

4/24/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/6/2022

Yes. Thank you for the information.

5/25/2022

No, please address the following:

- Budget table: National Project Coordinator and Finance/Admin Officer are charged to project components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. For this project, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 1.6 million - please use the co-financing portion or explore other possibilities (Agency's own-managed trust funds or funds from other co-financiers) to cover the costs associated with the project's execution (project's staff).

In addition, please provide a very short explanation of why the M&E budget is over the benchmark 5% (at 7%).

Also, please ensure that all documents that need to be circulated to Council are uploaded in the Portal as Public.

Agency Response

RE 5/25/2022

1) The budget has been revised and 100% of the costs of the Finance/Admin Officer is now charged to PMC (not the components). However, for the National Project Coordinator, this position has important technical functions in support of the implementation of the Components, as reflected in the TOR in Annex L of the ProDoc (see excerpt below). Thus, these costs are charged both to the project components and PMC.

? Overall technical lead for the implementation of all project outputs and activities and ensure technical soundness of project implementation.

? Ensuring technical lead and guidance in the implementation of all project outputs, in particular Outputs 1.1.1 (national and subnational policies), 2.1.1 (spatial planning and assessments), 2.2.1 (community and private participation in IAPS), and 3.1.3 (capacity development).

The co-financing portion of PMC cannot co-fund these two positions; however, the co-financing portion of PMC covers important additional project management support, as noted in MoEF's co-financing letter. These include but are not limited to office costs, admin/finance support, logistics and coordination support both in Jakarta and at the site level.

2) The costs of M&E are slightly over 5% (6.4% of total budget). This is because the M&E tasks cover not only regular project M&E, but also the development and implementation of site-based monitoring to measure changes in biodiversity and socio-economic indicators from baseline levels, as well as community-based monitoring, as reflected in the TOR of the M&E Specialist (Annex L of the ProDoc). Additionally, there is also a need for close on-site monitoring of the identified safeguards-related risks.

3) Thank you. The relevant documents have been uploaded as Public in the Portal.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/24/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/24/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/24/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/24/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/24/2022

Yes.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/24/2022

Yes.

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

NA

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 NA

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 NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/6/2022

Yes.

5/25/2022

No, please address the issues in the question on Annexes.

4/24/2022

No, please revise and resubmit.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/6/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations