

Strengthening Capacities for Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species (SMIAS) in Indonesia

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10705

Countries

Indonesia

Project Name

Strengthening Capacities for Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species (SMIAS) in Indonesia

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

9/28/2020

Review completed by PM

10/21/2020

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Biodiversity

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

10/8/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

10/19/2020

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

10/8/2020

No, please address the following:

Limiting focus on plants - The choice to limit focus to only IAPS is not well justified, particularly in the case of trainings of staff. The introduction of agricultural pests is also a major potential cause for concern and can have devastating impacts on agriculture. The inspection and management of plant materials for import should also include animals.

Components:

1.3.1 – Financing mechanisms – These financing mechanisms seem misdirected. A system of fines or fees after an IAS has been introduced would likely be woefully insufficient to raise resources. It would also require actually knowing who was responsible for the introduction, prosecuting them and that they actually have money to pay. It would be better to focus on prevention rather than spending resources on detective work. In addition, establishing a PES system just for IAS seems unlikely. STAP has helpful guidance on this subject. We understand that it is too early to know exactly which mechanisms could be effective and assess the

realities of each one. Certainly increased government budget would be ideal and including agricultural pests can help make the case for the financial benefits of prevention and convince the government of the need to invest.

2.1.1 – It will be important that this is done in a way to promote learning and application by other areas that may not have the resources to conduct in-depth studies.

3.1 – It is important that these activities learn from and share knowledge with projects that undertaken similar work. The GEF has funded many IAS projects that include awareness raising and there are likely existing initiatives in Indonesia and other countries (not necessarily supported by the GEF) that have worked on this issue. Awareness raising activities should be tested first to ensure that the proposed TOC matches reality.

Agency Response

- Regarding the focus on IAPS, the project only focuses on IAPS under Component 2 (the site level interventions); all activities under Components 1 and 3 address all IAS (plant and animal). A correction in this regard has been made under Output 1.1.1, which incorrectly mentioned IAPS in two places. Regarding the introduction of agricultural pests, which can include both plants and animals, and their impacts on agriculture, this is addressed at the national level under Output 1.2.2. At the site level, the primary focus on the landscape level approach is on priority protected areas and adjacent production forests, rather than agricultural lands (as noted in the description of Component 2), and IAS plants have been identified as the primary threat to natural ecosystems in protected areas and adjacent forests.
- Regarding Output 1.3.1, the description has been amended to reflect the fact that mechanisms for potential levies on shipping / air transportation, rather than mechanisms of fines/fees on IAS introductions, will be explored as potential financing tools for IAS management. Regarding PES as a financing mechanism, it may indeed not turn out to be feasible, but discussions with local stakeholders have indicated that it is worth exploring, and the project will review the STAP guidance on this.
- Regarding Output 2.1.1, new text has been added under this output in response to this comment.
- Regarding Outcome 3.1, new text has been added under this outcome in response to this comment.

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

10/8/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

10/8/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/8/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
10/8/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

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
10/8/2020

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
10/19/2020

Yes, thank you for the revisions. We understand some of the challenges in counting hectares in this context.

10/8/2020

No, the large numbers for core indicator 1 are not justified. In order for PAs to count in core indicator 1, they must complete METTs during the project and show an increased score. Therefore, the PAs reported should only be those where there will be activities that would increase the METT score so likely only the 2 targeted PAs should be included here.

Agency Response The reporting on Core Indicator 1 has been revised to focus on the two protected areas within the project's target landscapes. Data on the total # of hectares nationally that are important areas for biodiversity conservation, which will have enhanced management for biodiversity conservation due to the national-level IAS policy and customs work of the project, is now reported under Core Indicator 4.1.

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

10/8/2020

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

10/8/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/8/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/8/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/8/2020

Yes, however the project will need to ensure that it remains focused on prevention during PPG. In addition, management activities should focus on finding and establishing programs that have long-term sustainability beyond the life of the project. IAS management requires consistent and long term investment of resources and effort.

It will also be important to carefully consider potential unintended consequences of IAS use activities. In some cases, use strategies have actually led to the spread of an IAS after people want to have more of it available for their livelihoods.

Agency Response

The direction provided by the GEF is well noted. In terms of sustainability, the project will pursue a number of strategies to ensure the sustainability of new programs; in addition, ongoing national initiatives (including an initiative led by the National Planning Agency to develop significant new funding for environmental management) will provide additional support, and the project will try to create a link with this initiative to ensure long-term funding for IAS management. In terms of potential unintended consequences from IAS use, the project design includes plans to monitor and limit the uses of IAS, but further discussions with relevant stakeholders will be done during the PPG phase to make sure this aim is achieved.

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

10/8/2020

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

10/19/2020

Yes.

10/8/2020

No, please see the note on core indicators above. Please explain how the IAS strategy and plan will be implemented and financed and if this will start to take place during the project itself. If the IAS plan will start to be implemented, is this financing part of any of the co-financing that is identified in the PIF or will this be absorbed and financed within an existing government agency budget line (or funded by the new national Unit on IAS)?

Agency Response

Additional clarification has been added under Outcome 1.1 description, as follows.

Implementation of the NISSAP is expected to begin during the period of project implementation. At present, the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) is elaborating detailed regulations needed to support implementation of the NISSAP, which is a key part of the MoEF's larger ongoing national program to adopt an ecosystem-based approach to management of natural resources and biodiversity. MoEF is also continuing to advocate for a high-level regulatory framework, such as a Presidential Degree or Government Degree, to support the NISSAP and facilitate the involvement of all relevant line ministries (MMAF, MOA, Ministry of Education, BAPPENAS, Ministry of Trade, the Coordinating Ministry for Maritime Affairs and Investment and Ministry of Finance) in its implementation.

Regarding financing of the NISSAP, part of the co-financing provided by MoEF represents funds that will be allocated for implementation of the NISSAP. MoEF and other relevant ministries have already allocated approximately USD 450,000 to support the updating of the NISSAP and the associated regulatory work during the period of this project. Additional co-financing from MoEF and other ministries to implement the NISSAP will be generated once the NISSAP has been updated, the regulatory framework is finalized, and the implementation process gets underway. In addition to funding from government ministries/agencies, project activities under Output 1.3.1 (Financing mechanisms to support IAS management developed and tested) will help to create financing mechanisms for IAS management, including implementation of the NISSAP, over the long-term.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/8/2020

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

10/8/2020

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

10/8/2020

Yes. This project has committed to FPIC with indigenous peoples in the targeted protected areas. We note that some consultations have been made more difficult with restrictions because of COVID.

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

10/8/2020

Yes. During PPG it will be important to carefully consider gender aspects and ensure that women benefit from project activities.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
10/19/2020

Yes. There may be an opportunity to learn from the work done as part of other projects on these activities such as in Mexico, Cuba, and Fiji.

10/8/2020

No. From the beginning of PPG, it will be very important to engage PS actors both big and small as they are responsible for the import and spread of IAS. In order to be successful, they must actually be part of helping to structure the project and finding approaches that work for them and to provide GEBs. It would be good to see discussion of plans for involvement from the beginning.

Agency Response Additional text has been added to the private sector engagement section, as follows: "During the PPG, opportunities for involving private sector actors responsible for the import and spread of IAS in Indonesia, as well as private sector actors at the site level (involved in agriculture, tourism, water supply, etc.), will be explored further. This will be done through bilateral meetings and the organization of private sector forums, which will be carried out under the guidance of a PPG consultant focused on private sector engagement."

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

10/19/2020

Yes, thank you for doing the screening.

10/8/2020

Please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening (link below) and provide at least a basic climate risk screening at PIF stage. At a minimum, at PIF stage, the climate risks should be identified, listed and described. This can include:

- a.) Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location (or as close to it with data available), which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc).
- b.) Time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050). Please refer to list of examples from STAP guidance.
- c.) Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above (describe how the climate scenarios identified above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050).
- d.) Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and mitigation measures during PPG.

Agency Response A Climate Risk Screening was completed and has been uploaded to the GEF Portal. In addition, additional text based on the climate risk screening has been added to the risk mitigation strategy for potential climate change 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

10/19/2020

Yes, thank you.

10/8/2020

No, it would be good to discuss learning opportunities from GEF supported IAS work

Agency Response

Additional text on learning opportunities from GEF-supported IAS work has been added to the PIF (*Section 6. Coordination*).

"In addition to the above projects in Indonesia, the project also will seek to learn lessons and best practices from other GEF projects focused on IAS. As noted under Output 3.1.1, this will include GEF-funded project in Mexico "Enhancing National Capacities to manage Invasive Alien Species (IAS) by implementing the National Strategy on IAS", including its awareness raising programs focused on PA visitors as well as for sectors responsible for IAS entry into the country, as well as its other approaches and strategies to addressing IAS at points of entry and in the context of protected areas. The project will also explore learning opportunities from the GEF-funded project in Argentina "Strengthening of Governance for the Protection of Biodiversity through the Formulation and Implementation of the National Strategy on Invasive Alien Species (NSIAS)", in particular regarding the development and implementation of an effective national strategy for IAS management."

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

10/8/2020

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

10/19/2020

Yes.

10/8/2020

No, please see previous comments on knowledge sharing.

Agency Response A response has been provided under the previous comment (Part I, Question 2).

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

10/19/2020

Yes, thank you for the information this subject. IAS removal methods often do entail some risk of potential environmental damage if not properly managed.

10/8/2020

Yes. We note that this project has received a risk rating of "high". Please provide more details on this.

Agency Response

Additional clarification has been added in the risk section of the PIF, as follows.

“The project has been screened against environmental and social risks and has been rated ‘high risk’ in line with FAO’s Environmental and Social Safeguards (see certification in annex). The project is not designed or intended to impact negatively any protected area or dependent people. Instead, it is expected to improve the health of the protected areas by addressing the spread of invasive alien species and thus improving the ecosystem services. The project, however, is classified as high risk mainly because of the three risks factors below that can entail potentially significant, irreversible and/or cumulative negative environmental and social risks and/or impacts.

1. The project is located in critical habitats where project implementation can potentially impact negatively on ecosystem functions.
2. The project will demonstrate landscape-level approach to invasive alien plant species (IAPS) management which requires a precautionary approach as the Environmental and Social impacts of the IAPS control need to be properly assessed and managed. The limited experience, technical capacities and scientific resources for addressing IAS management challenges at the country level also exacerbates this risk.
3. The project area includes Indigenous peoples. Their economic, social, and legal status frequently limits their capacity to defend their rights to, and interests in, land, territories and natural and cultural resources, and may restrict their ability to participate in and benefit from development projects.

A full environmental and social impact assessment (ESIA, for high risk) will be carried out by an independent external expert and a process of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) will be followed (with an Indigenous People Plan if a substantial number of beneficiaries are Indigenous Peoples) during the PPG phase. The risks will be systematically screened during that phase and the mitigation measures will be identified. The risks identified and mitigation measures proposed will be incorporated into the project, and systematically monitored during project implementation to reduce the indirect, cumulative and associated impacts of the potential risks.

Please refer to Section 9. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks and Annex ‘IAS Risk Certification’ for more details on the risk certification.”

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

10/8/2020

Yes.

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

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

10/27/2020

Yes, thank you for addressing these issues.

10/19/2020

No, please address the following:

- 1- Co-financing to PMC has to be proportional to the GEF contribution to PMC (around 5%). Please amend.
- 2- Gender: While, the project describes plans to carry out a gender analysis during the PPG stage, the PIF does not describe any gender dimension related to the key components of the project. Please ask FAO to provide some additional information on gender dimensions related to the 3 components of the project, including; Policy/regulatory frameworks; Landscape approach; and knowledge and awareness.

10/8/2020

Not at this time. Please revise and resubmit.

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
First Review	10/8/2020	10/15/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/19/2020	10/26/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/23/2020	

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)

10/27/2020

Additional Review (as necessary)

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Indonesia is a tropical archipelago with over 13,000 islands, a land area of over 2 million km², a water area of about 5.8 million km², and over 80,000 km of coastline. Indonesia contains 7 major biogeographic regions. It is the most diverse country according to the STAR BD Index. Indonesia is also a country of islands, making it more susceptible to invasive alien species (IAS) than mainland countries. Unfortunately, however Indonesia's implementation of best practices in IAS prevention and management has lagged behind. They continue to allow the use of invasive trees and other species for commercialization.

This project will safeguard globally significant biodiversity and ecosystem services through improved prevention, control and management of invasive alien species (IAS) in Indonesia. The activities included in this project are: strengthened policy, regulatory, institutional and financing frameworks for IAS management; demonstrated landscape-level approach to invasive alien plant species (IAPS) management; strengthened knowledge & awareness of IAS issues among key stakeholders, and project monitoring and evaluation based on adaptive management principles. In addition to policy work and working on prevention through customs enforcement, this project will focus on two PAs that are also KBAs to pilot approaches in IAS prevention and management.

Innovation, sustainability and scaling-up: Indonesia has lagged behind other countries in its approach to IAS, so this will be a significant step forward for the country. They will have a specific focus on plants for some the activities and looking for potential use or value chains that will fund IAS control in the long term to provide sustainability in interventions. They will also work with customs enforcement, which will continue after project end, and assess the potential costs of inaction on IAS such as agricultural pests.

The project will support the improved management of 94,026 ha of protected areas and biodiversity mainstreaming on 27,439,072 ha.