

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Indonesia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10510

Countries

Indonesia

Project Name

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Indonesia

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

1/24/2022

Review completed by PM

4/6/2022

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

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

JS 3/30/2022 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 2/11/2022

1- Please remove BD-1-2a which is dedicated to the Global Wildlife Program and reassign corresponding funds to BD-1-1 and to BD-1-4. BD-1-4 is indeed related to agrobiodiversity, so please capture the funding dedicated to 1.2.2 under BD-1-4.

2- LD-1-4 relates more to land planning than the bulk of on-the-ground activities that will be funded in this SGP project with LD funding. Please remove LD-1-4 and split the LD contribution along the more appropriate LD-1-1 (sustainable land management, SLM), LD-1-2 (sustainable forest management, SFM) and LD-1-3 (Forest landscape restoration, FLR) entry points, reflecting the relative balance of SLM, SFM and FLR activities that will be supported.

Agency Response

23 March 2022:

1- BD-1-2a has been removed and the funds assigned to this focal area element reassigned to BD-1-1 and BD-1-4.

2- LD-1-4 has been removed and the funds assigned to this focal area element reassigned to LD-1-1 and LD-1-2. The indicative activities in the project landscapes include sustainable forest management interventions, consistent with LD-1-2. Restoration activities are primarily envisaged to be associated with SLM and agro-ecosystems, corresponding more to LD 1-1 than to LD 1-3.

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

JS 2/11/2022 - Cleared. We note the refinement of the project objective to reflect refinement in site selection. We also note the addition of component 3 dedicated to M&E, otherwise outcomes and outputs are the identical to PIF stage.

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

JS 3/30/2022 -Cleared, thank you.

JS 2/11/2022

1-We note co-financing is similar to that anticipated at PIF stage but the amount of investment mobilized greatly decreased from \$1,275,000 to \$410,000. In particular, Yayasan Bina Usaha Lingkungan ? National Host Institution, was foreseen to provide \$1,025,716.00 co-financing as grants, when all its co-financing is now reported as in-kind. Please explain this change.

The explanation on private sector co-funding are well noted.

Agency Response

23 March 2022:

1- The co-financing letter from Yayasan Bina Usaha Lingkungan has been re-issued, with USD 778,571 committed as grant (investment mobilized) contributions and USD 250,000 as in-kind (recurrent expenditures) contributions. The in-kind contributions correspond to salaries of YBUL staff supporting the SGP OP7 project but who are not part of the Country Program Management Unit, a share of the rental and maintenance expenses, and logistical support. The grant (investment mobilized) contributions are associated with complementary YBUL projects in the target locations and focused on the thematic areas of the SGP OP7 project over the period of 2022 through 2025.

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 JS 2/11/2022- Cleared.

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

JS 4/22/2022 - Cleared.

JS 4/18/2022 - Please provide more details on PPG utilization, providing at least a breakdown by the main expenditures categories:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$91,324.00			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
Project Preparation grant to finalize the full-size project: Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Indonesia	91,324	40,764.11	50,559.89
Total	91,324.00	40,764.11	50,559.89

JS 2/11/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

21st April 2022: Annex C was revised to provide a breakdown of PPG utilization by the main expenditure categories. Figures were updated as of 21st April 2022.

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

JS 4/6/2022 -Cleared, thank you

JS 3/30/2022 -1-2-3 Cleared, pending adequate response to 4:

4- Thank you for annex 16. However, it does not explain why, with a similar grant level, SGP OP7 targets only about 30% of the surface area that was reported under resilient production landscape and seascape management in the latest PIR of SGP6. Please explain.

JS 2/11/2022 - Targets are identical to PIF stage except for CI6: the mitigation target increased thanks to the addition of a target for AFOLU mitigation, and the small hydropower capacity was reduced by half (from 0.3 to 0.15MW).

1- Please add under table F an explanation on how all the targets were derived, including the main assumptions used to set the AFOLU target.

2- According to the EX-ACT calculations provided, all targeted GHG mitigation stems from avoided deforestation over 316 ha of tropical rainforest that would be transformed into annual cropland without the project interventions. Please clarify how this surface area relates to the surface area reported under core indicators 3 and 4. In particular, why isn't considered that mitigation benefits are to arise from the full area under restoration and improved management reported on these two indicators, which total 36,000 ha. At the very minimum, in addition to avoided deforestation, the restoration work reported under core indicator 3 should be included in the mitigation calculation.

3- Please fill out sub-indicator Indicator 6.3 since this project will improve energy efficiency in communities according to the CER document. Please explain how the target is calculated.

4- In addition to explain how they were derived, please revise upward or thoroughly justify why the targets on core indicator 3 and 4 total only 36,000 ha when SGP OP6, with a similar GEF grant, achieved more than 125,000 hectares under resilient production landscape and seascape management according to its latest PIR.

Agency Response

05 April 2022

As documented in the 2021 PIR of the OP6 project, the 130,698 ha of cumulative progress was considerably higher than the 47,000-ha target. The difference was largely attributed to synergies realized with partners such as WWF and RARE in the Wakatobi district, which is not a target landscape for OP7. Collaboration with partners is an important dimension of the SGP, something that is particularly promoted in the integrated landscape-seascape approaches in both the OP6 and OP7 projects. At the time of conceptualizing and preparing the OP7 project, there was limited information available regarding potential upscaling with landscape-seascape partners. Such partnerships are expected to materialize during project implementation, e.g., through co-financing of individual grant proposals and through development of the landscape-seascape strategies. The OP7 team and the local host organizations will advocate for upscaling opportunities during the implementation phase, and results achieved will be reported in the progress reports and independent evaluations.

23 March 2022:

1- Explanations on how the core indicator targets were derived have been added under Table E.

2- The 316 ha of avoided deforestation figure was estimated as follows (this estimation is provided in the EX ACT Excel file in the 'Calculations' worksheet):

Core Indicators 3 and 4:		36,000 ha		
Timeframe		20 years		
Without project				
Forest coverage rate in project landscapes:		25%	Rough approximation	
Forest coverage in project landscapes:		9,000 ha		
Annual deforestation:		0.73%	Source: MoEF processed (for period 2009-2011)	
Forest coverage, after 20 years:		7,786 ha		
Forest loss, after 20 years:		1,214 ha		
With project				
Forest coverage rate in project landscapes:		25%	Rough approximation	
Forest coverage in project landscapes:		9,000 ha		
Annual deforestation:		0.53%	INDC 2016: 38% reduction in GHG emissions, 2016-2030	
Forest coverage, after 20 years:		8,102 ha		
Forest loss, after 20 years:		898 ha		
Avoided deforestation:		316 ha		
Landscape	Area total (ha)	Natural Forest Land Cover 2019	Natural Forest Land Cover 2009	Gross Deforestation Total (ha) Annual
Bulukumba (Balantieng)	115,500.00	2,883.00	2,939.00	3,280.00
Gorontalo (Nantu-Boliyohuto)	1,125,700.00	54,863.00	59,898.00	6,698.00
SabuRaijua	460,500.00	523.00	1,611.00	119.00
Kendal&Wonosobo (Bodri)	1,084,900.00	4,360.00	3,074.00	100.00
<i>Source: MoEF processed, 2021</i>				

The estimation of mitigation benefits has been amended with the inclusion of potential emissions avoided associated with restoration interventions, reflecting the proposed restoration of 1,750 ha of degraded agricultural land restored through enhanced soil and

water conservation practices and improved vegetative cover; and 300 ha of degraded coastal ecosystems (including mangroves) restored. A description of the amended estimation is included in Annex 12 (Baseline report on climate change mitigation measures) and Annex 15 (Estimations of GHG emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector (EX-ACT)) to the Project Document.

3- Targets under sub-indicator 6.3 (Energy saved) have been filled out in the Core Indicator Worksheet. And Annex 12 to the Project Document (Baseline report on climate change mitigation measures) has been updated with the calculations of these targets.

4- A separate annex (Annex 16: Breakdown of estimated end targets for GEF 7 Core Indicators 3 and 4) has been created and annexed to the Project Document. Based on PPG phase consultations with national and landscape-seascape stakeholders and experiences during earlier phases in Indonesia and other SGP Upgraded Country Programmes, the targets for Core Indicators 3 and 4 are based on the realistic geographic scope of a typical SGP small grant project. The estimates are consistent with the bottom-up approach of the SGP and the integrated landscape approach. Through mainstreaming of the landscape strategies and their integration into local development plans, the grant interventions will provide guidance for upscaling at scale.

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

JS 3/30/2022 -Cleared.

JS 2/11/2022

1- The portal entry states "*few of the indicative outcomes and outputs outlined in the PIF were revised and merged through the process of refining the project design during the project preparation phase*". But the output and outcomes are identical, except for the addition of M&E. Please remove the sentence.

2- The portal entry includes: "*The proposed landscapes/seascape to be addressed by this project will be assessed and defined more precisely during the GEF project preparation phase*". Please delete and replace with what has been done during PPG.

3. Please reformulate "food security" and "Waste Treatment" in table 1 as they are not in themselves environmental threats.

4-The barriers have not been refined compared to PIF. The text is entirely identical. The portal entry even includes in barrier 2: "*More specific gaps and barriers to achieve this outcome will be defined during project preparation*". Please delete this sentence and revise the barriers to reflect the results of PPG work.

Agency Response

23 March 2022:

1- The sentence *few of the indicative outcomes and outputs outlined in the PIF were revised and merged through the process of refining the project design during the project preparation phase*" has been revised, only addressing the addition of a separate M&E component (Component 3).

2- The sentence *The proposed landscapes/seascape to be addressed by this project will be assessed and defined more precisely during the GEF project preparation phase*" has been deleted, and a description was added on how the project landscapes were defined/confirmed during the PPG phase.

3- The terms *food security* and *waste treatment* in Table 1 have been reformulated to *poor agricultural practices* and *pollution resulting from improper waste management*, respectively.

4- The barrier analysis prepared at the PIF stage remains relevant. This section of the ProDoc and CEO ER was revisited and some minor edits have been made.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/30/2022 - Cleared.

JS 2/11/2022- We note the CCM baseline report provided as annex 12, as well as the landscape baselines provided for the 4 target sites in annex 11.

1- Please explain in detail in the baseline (or wherever considered more relevant) how the design of OP7 addressed the 10 recommendations of the MTR of OP6.

2- Please add in the baseline and in the list of projects to coordinate with the following GEF-funded projects:

10757 - Maintaining and Enhancing Water Yield through Land and Forest Rehabilitation (MEWLAFOR) - UNIDO: the project will notably work on land and forest rehabilitation, including agroforestry, in the Brantas watershed, which close to one of the project site (Bodri watershed).

10511 - Crop Diversity Conservation for Sustainable Use in Indonesia - FAO: the project is relevant for SGP's anticipated work on agrobiodiversity. It will notably work in central Central Java (Klaten, Blora, Magelang Districts), which is also directly relevant for project interventions in the Bodri watershed.

3- Please add the following projects that were highlighted by council members to the baseline:

- o Forests and Climate Change (FORCLIME) (2015.2116.0-0)
- o Peatland management and rehabilitation (2017.2053.1-0)
- o Sustainable Agriculture Value Chain (17.2054.9-001.00)
- o Margowitan Model Forest established in 2004 in East Java, International Model Forest Network (IMFN) and the Regional Model Forest Network (RMFN) ? Asia

Please note that adding a project to the baseline involves describing how the project relates to the SGP proposal, anticipated interaction or how lessons learnt have been included in the design, and a description of the increment provided by this SGP proposals in the incremental reasoning section.

Agency Response

23 March 2022:

1- The baseline narrative has been amended with a discussion on how the OP7 design captured the recommendations presented in the MTR of the OP6 project.

2- GEF-financed projects 10757 and 10511 have been added to the baseline scenario section, as well as the section on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

3- The following projects have been added to the baseline scenario discussion.

- ? Forests and Climate Change (FORCLIME) (2015.2116.0-0)
- ? Peatland management and rehabilitation (2017.2053.1-0)
- ? Sustainable Agriculture Value Chain (17.2054.9-001.00)
- ? Margowitan Model Forest established in 2004 in East Java, International Model Forest Network (IMFN) and the Regional Model Forest Network (RMFN) ? Asia

Section 6 of the CEO ER (Institutional Arrangement and Coordination) has been amended with the addition of a description on how the OP7 project will coordinate with these complementary initiatives.

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

JS 3/30/2022 -All cleared.

JS 2/11/2022

1- The granting process (criteria, selection process, review and decision-making body, mechanisms to ensure transparency and fairness, etc), be it for small grants or strategic grants, is not described in the alternative scenario. Please correct by, at a minimum, adding references to the relevant parts of the ProDoc where it is described (e.g. Annex 18 and 21) , and, under each outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4, adding the specific criteria that will be used in this SGP project to ensure that the grants have these intended outcomes.

2- output 1.2.1 includes activity 1.2.1.1 "*Facilitate learning-by-doing capacity building to local CBOs through linking up with experienced NGOs, **protected area management entities**, and other strategic partners, on **participatory conservation and restoration techniques***" , when 1.2.1 is about adoption of sustainable agro-ecological practices and systems. 1.2.1.1 seems more relevant to 1.1.1, which is to "*restore degraded land, improve connectivity, support innovation in biodiversity conservation*". Please correct.

3- In the indicative activities under outputs related to small grants, please make sure to include explicitly grant selection and provision. Currently, output 1.2.1 has no activities corresponding to the delivery of the small grants.

4- Output 1.2.2:

4.a. Beyond FPIC, please clarify to what extent the project will develop awareness and capacity on the implementation of the Nagoya protocol to ensure the benefits arising from access and use of genetic resources are fairly shared.

4.b. The PIF was more detailed on the project`s anticipated work in agrobiodiversity conservation. Please be at least as specific as the PIF, referring to a relevant annex as necessary:

and forest conservation-based livelihoods of the local communities. The following summarizes anticipated work in agrobiodiversity conservation:

Landscapes/Seascape	Crop genetic resources	Types of potential activities
Sabu Raijua Regency - part of Savu Sea National Park, East Nusa Tenggara	Land races of corn (<i>Zea Mays</i>), sorghum (<i>Sorghum bicolor</i>), peanut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i>), sweet potato (<i>Ipomoea batatas</i>), green bean (<i>Vigna radiate</i>), toxtail millet (<i>Setaria italica</i> (L.)), Sugarpalm (<i>Borassus Flabellier</i>), and cotton (<i>Gosypium hirsutum</i>).	Promotion of land race species as important crops for food security, traditional cultural values, nutrition, and culinary innovation; Seed exchanges between farmers and farmer organizations; Seed banks; Farmer Field Schools; Marketing capacity building; Agricultural knowledge and farmers' rights events; Culinary culture events.
Bulukumba Regency, South Sulawesi	Land races of rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i>), corn (<i>Zea mays</i>) and cotton (<i>Gosypium hirsutum</i>).	
Nantu-Boliyohuto Wildlife Reserve Forest, Boalemo and Gorontalo Regencies	Land races of rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i>), banana (<i>Musa spp.</i>), mangosteen (<i>Garciana mangostana</i>), cacao (<i>Theobroma cacao</i> L.), coconut (<i>Cocos nucifera</i> L.) and sugar cane (<i>Saccharum officinarum</i>)	
Kendal Regency and Wonosobo Regency, North Coast of Java, Central Java	Purwoceng (<i>Pimpinella pruatjan</i> Molkenb), Mountain papaya (<i>Vasconcellea pubescens</i>), land races potato.	

5- output 1.3: Please clarify how this output is to generate global environmental benefits, since the link between livelihood interventions and e.g. biodiversity benefits is not automatic (see e.g. Roe, Dilys, et al. "Are alternative livelihood projects effective at reducing local threats to specified elements of biodiversity and/or improving or maintaining the conservation status of those elements?." Environmental Evidence 4.1 (2015): 22). Please notably explain in detail the grant selection criteria that will be used to that effect, and clarify the GEF increment to the baseline government effort on BUMDes development.

5- Output 1.4.1:

5.a: Under this output, the project is to demonstrate "at least one simple model micro-finance mechanism for implementation of community-level low-carbon solutions". Please clarify what is meant by "one simple model micro-finance mechanism". What, in plain language, is the project to demonstrate exactly?

5.b. The PIF announced that under this output "Three models of community-based energy efficient management will be supported contributing to local energy policy development". Please confirm in the portal entry that it is still the case, elaborate in more detail on these three models that must have been further defined during PPG or justify any change made to initial plans.

6- Component 2:

6a. The portal entry states "*For this reason, the project will create multi-stakeholder landscape platforms and strengthen existing ones to support participatory landscape planning and adaptive management.*". Please replace by a sentence clarifying in which target landscapes platforms are to be created and, where they already exist, provide the baseline and be more precise on what aspects platforms will be strengthened thanks to this project.

6b. Please clarify why the baseline assessments for project landscapes have not been carried out during PPG.

6c. Please clarify *how* strategic grants are to foster upscaling. What do these strategic grants fund in practice and what are the selection criteria for these?

Agency Response

23 March 2022:

1- The following has been added to the narrative description of Component 1: "Terms of reference will be prepared for each call for proposal for small grants, following the SGP operational guidelines (see Annex 19 to the Project Document) and on-granting provisions outlined in Annex 22 to the Project Document. The small grant proposals will be required to align with the priorities and criteria outlined in the landscape strategies, and each proposal will include descriptions of how the interventions will contribute to the overall project metrics in the project results framework, including the GEF 7 core indicators, as well as gender mainstreaming objectives. The local host organizations in each landscape will provide capacity building to the community-based organizations in developing proposals, and the proposals will be reviewed by the Country Program Management team, with assistance from technical support consultants, prior to presentation to the National Steering Committee (NSC) for final review and approval. The proposals will be reviewed according to the criteria defined in the Terms of Reference and the landscape strategies."

2- The description of Activity 1.2.1.1 has been rephrased to the following: "Award grants for interventions aimed at increasing the uptake of and strengthening implementation of agro-ecological practices".

3- The list of indicative activities under Output 1.2.1 has been amended with inclusion of selection and provision of small grants, as outlined above in the revision to Activity 1.2.1.1. Please also refer to the entry added to the narrative of Component 1, as described above in the response to comment No. 1 in this section.

4.a. The capacity building activities under Output 1.2.2, as well as communication and knowledge management under Output 2.2.1 have been amended with inclusion of capacity and awareness-raising on implementation of the Nagoya Protocol.

4.b. Information on crop genetic resources and potential interventions in the project landscapes has been added to the narrative description of Output 1.2.2.

5- (Output 1.3). The majority of SGP grants are focused on improving the well-being of local communities by more sustainably managing and utilizing resources in the landscapes where they reside. These improved management practices contribute to the generation of global environmental benefits. Each grant proposal will be required to describe how the results of the intervention will contribute to the overall metrics of the project, including to the GEF 7 core indicator end targets. With respect to the village enterprises, BUMDes, this is one of the cornerstones of the Indonesian government's effort to empower local communities to engage in productive ventures. Collaborating with the BUMDes initiative is part of the OP7 strategy to better link up with local government development planning and help ensure sustainability and upscaling of the results achieved through the individual grants.

5.a. (Output 1.4.1). This mechanism is envisaged to be a public-private-community partnership agreement, including participation by a micro-finance institution, an enabling private sector partner (e.g., providing hardware), and local government.

5.b. (Output 1.4.1). The interventions will also contribute to local energy policy development by mainstreaming the priority actions outlined in the landscape strategies (Outcome 2.1.2) into local development planning and budgetary frameworks. The actual models demonstrated will be demand-driven, i.e., elaborated in the grant proposals submitted by community-based organizations in the target landscapes. The end target for Indicator 11 has been updated, with reference to these envisaged models of public-private-community partnership.

6a. The subject sentence regarding multi-stakeholder landscape platforms has been deleted and the following entry has been added to the narrative of Component 2: ?The establishment of new or strengthening of existing multi-stakeholder landscape platforms will be further clarified during the early stages of project implementation, with the support of host organizations recruited for each of the target landscapes-seascapes. For example, there are existing watershed committees in the Bodri River (Central Java) and Balantieng Watershed (South Sulawesi) landscapes. The project will first explore possibilities to link up with these existing committees; however, having separate focused multi-stakeholder landscape platforms might be the preferred option after additional consultation is made with stakeholders during implementation.?

6b. The landscape-seascape approach promoted in the OP7 project strategy is based on the experiences gained through application of the Indicators of Resilience in Socio-ecological Production Landscapes and Seascapes (SEPLS), piloted through the Community Development and Knowledge Management for the Satoyama Initiative (COMDEKS). Baseline information on the project landscapes-seascapes was gathered during the PPG phase and documented in the Landscape-Seascape Profiles annexed to the Project Document. The community-based landscape approach includes conducting participatory landscape-seascape baseline assessments during the early stage of project implementation. These baseline assessments will be facilitated by the host organizations recruited for the target landscapes-seascapes, and the landscape-seascape strategies will be developed through participatory processes based on the findings of the landscape-seascape baseline assessments.

6c. As with other SGP projects, the scope and selection processes for strategic grants will follow guidance included in the SGP Operational Guidelines (see Annex 19). Terms of reference will be developed during project implementation for the strategic grants in consultation with the SGP National Steering Committee (NSC), Country Programme Management Unit (CPMU), the UCP Global Coordinator, and the UNDP Country

Office (CO), and then awarded through competitive bidding and agreed by the NSC. The terms of reference developed for these calls for proposals will describe the selection criteria, e.g., track record in advocating for upscaling of community-based environmental initiatives, experience and success in linking community-based organizations with green value chains and building enduring partnerships with larger NGOs and/or the private sector, experience in expanding uptake of micro-finance instruments by community-based organizations, etc.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/30/2022 -Cleared.

JS 2/11/2022- As explained in the first comment box of this review sheet:

1-Please remove BD-1-2 and add BD-1-4. Please justify the alignment with BD-1-4 (in situ agrobiodiversity conservation in a Vavilov center of origin - Output 1.2.2).

2-Please remove LD-1-4 and justify alignment with LD-1-1, LD-1-2 and/or LD-1-3. In doing so, please note that currently the alignment with the LD focal area is justified by mentioning, among others, support to " agrosilvofisheries practices". Please explain what this means and note that it is unlikely that fisheries work can be made eligible for LD funding.

Agency Response

23 March 2022:

1- As responded to the first comment, BD-1-2 has been removed and funds allocated under this focal area element have been reassigned to BD-1-1 and BD-1-4.

2- Focal area element LD-1-4 has been removed and the funds allocated to this focal area element have been reassigned to LD-1-1 and LD-2-2. Agrosilvofisheries have been removed as one type of indicative activity.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/30/2022 -Cleared.

JS 2/11/2022

1- Please provide a table summarizing for each target landscape the baseline/business as usual scenario, the SGP OP7 increment and corresponding global environmental benefits.

2- Please see comment on the alternative scenario relative to the increment of output 1.3 on livelihoods.

Agency Response

23 March 2022:

1- A table has been added summarizing the baseline/business-as-usual scenario, the SGP OP7 increment, and corresponding global environmental benefits. The GEBs at the landscape level will be broken down according to the grants approved by the NSC and results achieved, and reported in progress reports.

2- The comment regarding the increment of Output 1.3 regarding livelihoods has been responded to above.

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

JS 3/30/2022 -Cleared.

JS 2/11/2022- The section on global environmental benefits (GEBs) in the portal entry is very generic and does not present the GEBs that will be generated by the project. Please describe here qualitatively and quantitatively the anticipated GEBs if it is not done elsewhere in the revised submission.

Agency Response

23 March 2022:

The narrative on global environmental benefits (GEBs) has been updated.

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

JS 2/11/2022- Cleared.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/30/2022 -Cleared.

JS 2/11/2022 - A map is provided with embedded coordinates. We note the more detailed map included in the ProDoc.

1- Please add coordinates as text in the portal entry.

Agency Response

23 March 2022:

1- Midpoint geospatial coordinates of the target landscapes-seascapes are listed below and have been added as text in the portal entry.

Landscape-seascape (Province)	Midpoint geospatial coordinates	
	Latitude	Longitude
Nantu Boliyohuto Wildlife Reserve (Gorontalo)	0.869 N	122.35 E
Balantieng Watershed (South Sulawesi)	5.406 S	120.142 E
Sabu Raijua District (East Nusa Tenggara)	10.535 S	121.844 E
Bodri Watershed (Central Java)	7.118 S	110.15 E

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

JS 2/11/2022 - Cleared. We note the summary of PPG stakeholder consultations in annex 8 and the SEP in annex 7.

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

JS 3/30/2022 -Cleared.

JS 2/11/2022 - We note the Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan (GAP) provided as Annex 9.

1- The GAP includes many "*Indicative Gender-Responsive Activities*" and many "*Indicative Types of Gender Responsive Interventions*". Please clearly separate what is to be implemented to mainstream gender irrespective of the specific small grants that will be funded from what is truly indicative, i.e. contingent on the community projects that will be developed under the project.

2- We note no indicators, associated baselines and targets were developed to monitor GAP implementation so that it seems that gender monitoring would be limited to tracking the number of women-led projects supported and the number of projects that improve the participation and decision-making of women in natural resource governance (indicators 12 and 15 of the monitoring plan). Please revise to make clear what the GAP intends to achieve, the baseline and how it will be monitored.

Agency Response

23 March 2022:

1- The Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan (Annex 9 to the Project Document) has been revised, by outlining the gender-responsive activities that are consistent with the activities described for each of the project outputs in the Project Document and CEO ER.

2- The mandatory SGP-OP7 gender mainstreaming indicators, listed below, are integrated into the project results framework:

1. ? Number of participating community members (gender disaggregated) (Indicator 1, GEF 7 Core Indicator 11)
2. ? Number of women-led projects supported (Indicator 15)
3. ? Number of projects that are contributing to equal access to and control of natural resources by women and men (Indicator 6)

4. ? Number of projects that improve the participation and decision-making of women in natural resource governance (Indicator 12)
5. ? Number of projects that target socio-economic benefits and services for women (Indicator 9)

Moreover, the gender mainstreaming framework in the Gender Action Plan (Annex 9 to the Project Document) has been revised, with the inclusion of five indicators and associated targets.

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

JS 2/11/2022 - Cleared.

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

JS 2/11/2022 - Cleared. We note the risk register provided in Annex 5 and the separate COVID and climate risk screening.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/30/2022 -Cleared.

JS 2/11/2022

1- Please consolidate and streamline the presentation of the NSC, which is split in several part of this section. In particular, the composition of the NSC and its key decision-making role for grants is only described in a later paragraph after a first elaboration on the NSC roles and some elaboration on UNDP's role.

Agency Response

23 March 2022

1- The description of the NSC has been consolidated and streamlined. Further information regarding the NSC is provided in the SGP Operational Guidelines, annexed to the Project Document (see Annex 19 to the Project Document).

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

JS 2/11/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 2/11/2022 - Cleared. We note the timeline for KM products embedded in the workplan provided as annex 3.

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

JS 2/11/2022 - Cleared. We note the Moderate risk rating and the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure provided in Annex 4.

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

JS 3/30/2022 -Cleared.

JS 2/11/2022

1- Data source and means of verification are often very indirect and not satisfactory. Please revise so that the monitoring plan includes as much as independent ground truthing as possible and is more specific on how the "data source/collection methods" will allow to measure what the indicator is supposed to capture (e.g. how will the project concretely assess that a given area is under improved management to benefit biodiversity, or how would the project monitor AFOLU mitigation without collecting deforestation data when it is assumed that most climate mitigation benefits will be derived from avoided forest loss).

2- Please revise the names of the indicators. Most are not worded as indicators but as outcomes (e.g. Indicator 7: Maintenance and use of local agrobiodiversity [...]), with the actual indicator not always related to its headline name (e.g. indicator 5 Sustainable management of common resources [...] actually measures a number of partnerships and not at all the level of sustainability of resource management).

3- The indicators proposed under outcome 1.1 do not measure progress on this outcome, which is related to enhanced biodiversity and ecosystem services. Please revise to include at least one indicator that aims to measure progress on biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Agency Response

23 March 2022:

1- Data sources and means of verification have been updated in the monitoring plan for GEF-7 core indicators 3, 4, and 6, adding ground-truthing and review of land cover information collected by governmental departments and ministries and other sources.

2- The names of the outcome indicators have been revised accordingly.

3- Indicator 5, under Outcome 1.1, on the number of new partnerships between CBOs and enabling stakeholders, including NGOs, protected area management entities, private sector enterprises, government departments, etc., for participatory conservation and restoration initiatives, is considered a relevant measure of how local communities will be sustainably engaged in conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services. Core indicator 4 measures progress on biodiversity and ecosystem services. Moreover, the individual grant projects will include specific metrics on contributions towards biodiversity conservation and protection of ecosystem services. Consistent with the bottom-up, demand-driven approach of the SGP, the specific biodiversity benefits generated will be defined in the grant proposals and verified through monitoring and evaluation conducted during execution of the approved interventions.

An additional indicator (No. 7), on agrobiodiversity, has been added under Outcome 1.2.

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

JS 2/11/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/6/2022- Cleared. We note the Agency confirms that there is no co-financing available to cover staff cost and adequate ToRs are provided for staff charged across components.

JS 3/30/2022 -

1b - Several project staff have been charged across the 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. In exceptional cases, the project's staff can be charged to the project's components with clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component, as provided in this resubmission. However, for this project, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is \$208,376 and, out of \$4.3 million of co-financing, more than 1 million is in the form of grants. As GEF-funded PMC is already at the 5% limit, please cover the staff cost from co-financed PMC or justify that all co-finance is already utilized, earmarked to cover other costs and/or unable to cover staff cost.

All the rest is cleared.

JS 2/11/2022 - The audit template submitted with this endorsement request has been reviewed and cleared from a technical and programmatic perspective. The financial, operational, and policy due diligence may reveal issues that may still need to be addressed by UNDP.

1- Budget : We note 70.8% of GEF project financing is allocated to grants (68.9% once the EA fees are discounted).

1a- The budget in the portal entry is not readable. Please ensure that the budget is fully readable in the next submission.

1b- Some project staff (the SGP coordinator and Finance Program assistant) are not charged only to PMC but also across components. However, the terms of reference provided in annex 6 do not link these cross charges to unique outputs, but rather reflect generic project management duties. Either provide Terms of Reference that describe unique outputs/deliverables under the respective components on which these staff are charged, or charge them under PMC, both GEF and co-funded parts of PMC.

Agency Response

05 April 2022:

The Lead Implementing Partner (Executing Agency), YBUL, has committed USD 1,028,571 in co-financing, including USD 250,000 of in-kind (recurrent expenditures). The available co-finance is fully utilized and earmarked to support project management and other costs and, therefore, unable to cover additional project management staff cost.

23 March 2022:

1a- The budget in the portal has been re-entered to ensure readability.

1b- The terms of reference of SGP Coordinator and Finance Program Assistant included in Annex 6 to the Project Document describe the unique duties of these two positions associated with project management, as well as Components 1, 2 and 3. Please note that there are separate descriptions for the SGP Coordinator and Finance Program Assistant under project management, Component 1, Component 2, and Component 3. Some additional details have been provided referring to specific outputs.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/30/2022 -Cleared.

JS 2/11/2022 - Please see comment on the monitoring plan above.

Agency Response

23 March 2022:

Responses to the comments on the monitoring plan are described above.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/30/2022 -Cleared.

JS 2/11/2022

1- While the Annex 12 does provide explanations on the mitigation targets, annex 11 does not explain how the other targets were defined. Please see comments on core indicators.

2- Please clarify what steps were taken during PPG to engage with other GEF investments in target geographies, including FOLUR.

Agency Response

23 March 2022:

1- A separate annex (Annex 16) has been created with breakdowns of the estimated end targets for GEF 7 Core Indicators 3 and 4.

2- Stakeholder consultations were conducted with each of the four target landscapes-seascapes, including through organizing hybrid in-person / remote stakeholder workshops. These consultations included discussion of potential synergies with other

GEF investments. Separate consultations were held with the FOLUR PPG team and UNDP colleagues in Indonesia.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/30/2022 -Cleared.

JS 2/11/2022

1- Please describe in the portal entry the steps that were taken during PPG to collaborate with the 3 projects outline by the German Council member.

2- Please see comments on the baseline.

Agency Response

23 March 2022:

1- The German development cooperation in Indonesia provides extensive technical and financial assistance to the Government of Indonesia. The Forests and Climate Change Programme (FORCLIME) is a technical cooperation focused on supporting the government on sustainable management of forests, with the overall objective to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the forest sector and improving the livelihoods of poor rural communities. The geographic focus includes the provinces of Central Sulawesi, Papua, and West Papua. Other projects under the German development cooperation include the Peatland Management and Rehabilitation (PROPEAT) project (focused on the Kayan Sembakung Delta in North Kalimantan Province), and the Sustainability and Value Added in Agricultural Supply Chains in Indonesia project (SASCI+), part of a global program, focusing on rubber, palm oil, cocoa and coffee in the provinces of West Kalimantan and Central Sulawesi. The OP7 project will take steps to link up with the German development cooperation programmes and projects, including FORCLIME, PROPEAT and SASCI+, at different levels. Representatives from the German development cooperation in Indonesia will be invited to participate in the inception workshop, facilitating linkages with the complementary projects and programmes, e.g., through capacity building activities, stakeholder workshops, policy dialogues, etc. At the landscape-seascape level, OP7 host organizations will invite representatives of other donors, including the German development cooperation, to participate in the multi-stakeholder platforms and capitalize on opportunities for synergies among complementary initiatives.

2- As responded to the comment on the baseline, the baseline narrative has been updated with information on the subject complementary projects.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

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 JS 2/11/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 2/11/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

JS 4/22/2022 - Yes, the project is recommended for endorsement.

JS 4/18/2022 - Please address the last comment on PPG utilization reporting: Please provide more details on PPG utilization, providing at least a breakdown by the main expenditures categories:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$91,324.00			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
Project Preparation grant to finalize the full-size project: Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Indonesia	91,324	40,764.11	50,559.89
Total	91,324.00	40,764.11	50,559.89

All the rest is cleared.

JS 3/30/2022 -Not at this stage. Please address the remaining comment (core indicators; Annex/budget) above and resubmit.

JS 2/11/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	2/11/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/30/2022

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	4/6/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/22/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations