

# Strengthening of Social Forestry in Indonesia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

9600

**Countries**

Indonesia

**Project Name**

Strengthening of Social Forestry in Indonesia

**Agencies**

World Bank

**Date received by PM**

5/29/2019

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Paul Hartman

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF** ☐**CEO Endorsement** ☐**Project Design and Financing**

**1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

06/04/19

The objective of the project has been modified at the request of the government of Indonesia from "improve community management of forest in select priority areas and to conserve biodiversity of global significance to "improve forest land use rights and community management in selected priority areas allocated for social forestry." Please ensure that a focus on conservation of biodiversity of global significance is maintained as part of project implementation, particularly as the bulk of GEF financing for the project will come from the BD FA. Please make certain that the importance of biodiversity in the targeted landscapes and the generation of BD GEBS is weaved throughout the narrative in the PID and ProDoc.

In the PIF there was greater overlap with the Indonesia One Map policy and program. In the CEO endorsement the mapping focus is on strengthening the MoEF's Indicative Map of Social Forestry Area (Peta Indikatif dan Area Perhutanan Sosial, PIAPS) and the Social Forestry Navigating System (SINAV) through capacity

building and knowledge sharing for replication. While this more specific mapping focus seems to be justified, it would be good to understand how this relates to the One Map policy and the investment that the WB has put into the Acceleration Program of One Map Policy Implementation Project.

08/02/19

Comments have been adequately addressed. It has been clarified that the “One Map” project focuses on land outside the forest area while the SSF project will focus on the land inside forest area but these are nonetheless integrated.

Cleared

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

The GOI aims to use the SFP to address the systemic poverty by selecting, demarcating and registering degraded forest lands in forest areas as community-managed while simultaneously enhancing forest management and restoration in these degraded forest areas. When these degraded areas in buffer zones of critical protected areas are well managed, it will help reduce the pressure to convert old-growth forest for agriculture, thus, address the drivers of deforestation and forest degradation which will generate global environment benefits (e.g. conservation of biodiversity of global significance and mitigating GHG emissions). The project will certainly maintain its focus on conservation of biodiversity of global significance in the project implementation. The project has put biodiversity as a key criterion for selecting sites. The selection process has resulted in the project sites that are located at the buffer zones of national parks or protection forests which are threatened by forest degradation and deforestation and are critical habitats for a number of threaten and endangered species in Indonesia. And progress on biodiversity aspect would be monitored through dedicated indicators (PDO and Intermediate level indicators) in the project result framework. The project appraisal document has also elaborated the narrative on the importance of biodiversity and how the project would contribute to the objective and GEF-6 strategies on forest and biodiversity conservation, including its relevance and consistency with the Indonesia’s Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and SDGs (please refer to pg 25, section C – Relevance to Higher-level Objectives).

While the Bank financed “One Map” and GEF financed SSF projects are still substantively integrated maintaining close coordination and synergy, the processing and the implementation of them are separated. The World Bank Financed “One Map” project focuses on land outside the forest area (“Kawasan Hutan”) and affirmation of its boundary, the SSF project will focus on the land inside forest area. The PIAPS is an online map which identifies potential areas to be included in the SFP. The map is developed based on harmonization of existing maps of the MoEF with maps provided by nongovernmental organizations and civil society, including results of

consultations with local government and other stakeholders. The GOI carries out on-the-ground technical verification through “VerTek” process. The VerTek process takes time as the team must overlay the proposed area map with: (i) forest function maps and results of forest boundary mapping exercise; (ii) maps of existing forestry permits and other types of permits; (iii) the FMU map, as well as an analysis of the forest/land cover; and (iv) maps of areas of high conservation value. Furthermore, the technical verification team carries out field surveys and stakeholder consultations. As such, PIAPS follows the One Map policy of the GOI.

The GOI also developed SiNav – a web-based navigation system that helps integrate different institutions to work and support social forestry programs. SiNav is also used to monitor and evaluate the implementation progress of social forestry activities on the ground, based on four indicators: i) SF access and permits application; ii) development of SF entrepreneurship; iii) tenure conflict management; and iv) increasing environmental behavior.

To strengthen the SFP, a program level National Steering Committee (NSC) is being established with the support from the SSF project. The same NSC will also provide overall strategic guidance to KfW supported social forestry project which the proposed SSF project is closely coordinating with. The NSC will have senior level representation from the Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency (ATR/BPN) which is executing the One Map project. Similarly, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (which is executing the SSF project) is member of One Map project Steering Committee. At the project level, the Bank task teams have several experts common to both projects. Both MoEF and ATR/BPN are also members of joint committees on Tenure Resolution in Forest Areas (PPTKH) under Presidential Regulation 88/2017 and Agrarian Reform under Presidential Regulation 88/2018 coordinated by the Coordinating Ministry for Economic Affairs (CMEA). Both the SSF and One Map projects support this coordination platform toward harmonizing and unifying policy and approaches to land resource allocation.

## **2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

06/04/19

The project structure/design are broadly appropriate to achieve expected outcomes. However some questions exist in the specifics of implementation that should have been explored during the PPG phase, including in component 1:

1. What specific capacity needs do you foresee at the government and community level in order to implement the Social Forestry Program;
2. Related to this, what types of specific training and awareness raising at the village/community level and capacity building at the district, province and national levels will the project undertake.

Moreover, while a description has been provided to explain how GEF resources are incremental to those provided through other resources, this could be further strengthened in the narrative.

08/02/19

While the response provided is generally adequate, it would be helpful to see a short summary of the capacity needs assessment that was undertaken during the project preparation period in order to better understand community and government gaps that it identified based on the contexts of the specific landscapes, and the range of options the project will employ to address these. Please provide this as a separate document in English or include a description of these results in the project documents.

10/23/19

Yes, the project structure and design are appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes. Additional information on capacity needs of target villages has been provided in the PAD and PID. While not explicitly stated in the project documents, during implementation please ensure that GEF TF resources are not used for community plantation activities if they are using non-native species, which is not allowable. Project co-financing resources, however, may be used for this purpose if it is intended.

Cleared

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

October 2019: Thank you for the comment, the team has provided additional information in the PAD sub-component 1.3 to summarize the capacity needs assessment result that was conducted during the project preparation (See PAD -Section II Project Description; B. Project Components, para #34; pg.18 and para #7; pg.62 and the PID – Subcomponent 1.3). Assessment made available in the project files.

-----

July 2019: As part of the project preparation, capacity needs, and types have been identified which the project would support including at the government and community level. These include among others, capacity development strategy for the social forestry working groups and facilitators at the provincial level to ensure the TA provides are competent to provide technical assistance; formation of social forestry community groups and roles/responsibilities; development of social forestry management plans; sustainable use of natural resources (timber and non-timber products, environmental services), etc. While specific trainings could include training on mapping, processes to submit permit requests, tenurial conflict assessment/mediation/resolution, FGRM, eco-tourism, livelihoods sub-project development/implementation, forest protection, participatory mapping, information system, entrepreneurship (innovation, technology, investment, marketing,

partnership), financial management (e.g. revolving fund management), etc. These will be site specific. While the GOI has its own budget resources for capacity building, the GEF incremental costs will help (i) better target these TAs; and (ii) promote conservation measures that will generate global environmental benefits. (please refer to pg 56-62, and Annexes 2, 3 and 4 for further details).

**3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

06/04/19

Yes, the GEF financing is a portion of the total financing indicated (along with co-financing) and is sufficient to achieve each of the three project components. However, as indicated in box 5 below, evidence of this co-financing still needs to be provided.

08/02/19

Table C has been modified and several sources of co-financing previously listed have now been removed. Proof of co-financing for the remaining GOI source has been provided.

Cleared

**Response to Secretariat comments**

The co-financing for the project is from the GOI budgetary resources and in-kind contribution. These have been confirmed and the letter of cofinancing confirmation was provided with the CEO package. Project negotiations will again reconfirm the cofinancing as agreed with the GoI.

**4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

06/04/19

The project does account for major risks and includes mitigation strategies. While the project's impact on climate change is referred to in the ProDoc narrative, in the Key Risks Table climate change isn't identified as project risk to be addressed . Please include climate change in this table and identify the level or risk this represents and a strategy to mitigate against this.

08/02/19

While not specifically detailed in the table, climate change risks are highlighted in the PAD along with potential mitigation measures.

Cleared

**Response to Secretariat comments** Thank you. While the table in the PAD (auto-generated SORT table) captures only broad groups, the narrative captures the overall approach for risk mitigation in each category. Climate change is indeed an integral part of the project design as the key focus of the project is to improve forest management in degraded forest land. Forest management plans and business development plans that the project supports include these objectives including climate change induced risks and their mitigation measures such as selection of seedlings and/or species for forest regeneration activities and agro-forestry activities. The climate risk has been included in the environment risks narrative (Para 92, Section VI, PAD).

**5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

06/04/19

No. In Table C sources of co-financing indicated include the Government of Indonesia, the ADB, the World Bank, and the Government of Germany through KfW. Only the Government of Indonesia has provided a letter as evidence of their support and have included the entire amount of co-financing. Evidence of the co-financing from the other sources should be provided.

08/02/19

Table C has been modified and several sources of co-financing previously listed have now been removed. Proof of co-financing for the remaining GOI source has been provided.

Cleared

**Response to Secretariat comments**

January 2020

Cofinancing support letter is included in the package.

=====

Table C of the GEF data sheet indicates cofinancing from GoI, and perhaps the reviewer is referring to an earlier version. As explained in point 21 above, the cofinancing is from the GOI and letter of support has been provided.

#### **6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

06/04/19

It would be helpful to see the emissions reductions calculations using the FORDA guidance to better understand how the total for indicator 6 on greenhouse gas emissions mitigated was derived. Using the FAO EXACT tool is another means through which such a calculation can be demonstrated.

In is unclear why the project targets only 30% participation by women as per indicator 11

08/02/19

I. The gross calculation sheet provided doesn't help to clarify the methodology used to estimate carbon stock per ha and final calculations of emissions mitigated and it is not enough to say that such calculations will be made during the implementation phase. Overall the sheet contains many inconsistencies and the decision by the Agency to reduce the estimate provided in the calculation sheet in terms of what will be reported by nearly 60% is both unusual and seemingly indicative of a lack of faith in the calculation. Considering both GEF trust fund and co-financing the estimated indicator total seems unambitious. Other specific comments on the calculation sheet include:

1. It is unclear what the headings (HKM, HTR, Partnership, Indicative) are referring to and how the values were determined.
2. The total number of hectares identified in program indicator four for area that will be under improved practices is 300,000 and split between improved management to benefit biodiversity (150k ha) and area under sustainable land management in production systems (150k ha). The calculation in the calculation sheet only seems to refer to the impact of agroforestry and not areas under improved practices for BD. It is unclear why this is the case as one would assume that some amount of avoided deforestation would result from the management of important biodiversity lands and that this would generate a carbon benefit.



3. The total area of the 5 targeted landscapes listed equals rough 300,000 hectares, but the proposed SFF area for "HKM," "HTR" and "Partnership" only equals about 10% of this, and when this is added to the 'indicative' total they do not sum to the the total amount of the targeted landscapes. It is unclear how these calculations were made and why only 10% estimate of the total area is estimated to generate carbon benefits.

Please provide a more clear and justifiable estimate that clearly lays out the methodology and calculations behind the numbers and is consistent with the estimate in indicator four and with the project's activities and approach.

II. It is understood that the 'cultural context' in many rural communities across the globe is stacked against women, which is why a specific focus on gender is required to ensure equal participation in project activities to the greatest extent possible. While the roles different genders play in various community development activities might precluded women from taking part in some activities, given the broad outreach of the project to the communities through awareness raising, conservation management, and economic development initiatives it remains unclear why the expectation is that only 30% of women would participate. Please further justify or revise.

10/24/19

I. The explanation still needs clarification and doesn't follow GEF guidelines. We would be available to discuss directly with the agency if needed. Please address the following:

- a. the carbon benefit has to be calculated over a period of 20 years and not 3 years as it seems to be (the calculation is the result of 45 teCO<sub>2</sub>/ha after only 3 years);
- b. we don't understand the 169 teCO<sub>2</sub>/ha in the excel sheet;
- c. the result should be the difference between the carbon stock without the project and the carbon stock with the project. What is the carbon stock without the project?
- d. the carbon stock should be different for different land uses (shrub is different from bareland);
- e. the restoration should be reported in the Core Indicator sheet (number 3);
- f. the agency should follow GEF guidelines ([http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN\\_GEF.C.54.11.Rev\\_02\\_Results.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.54.11.Rev_02_Results.pdf)) and is invited to use EX-ACT tool to make the calculation easier and clearer.

II. The response provided on gender inclusion is sufficient at this stage. During the development of site specific action plans, please make sure to maximize outreach and participation of women in project activities and as a beneficiary of outcomes.

January 31, 2020

1. The carbon calculation has been sufficiently revised and the estimate is reasonable.

2. The hectares of restoration reflected in this GHG calculation (40,452 ha) should be included in the core indicators table of the CEO Endorsement document under indicator three. Please reflect this amount in core indicator 3 as well as part of the calculation of GHG mitigated in indicator 4.

Feb 4, 2020

Hectares of areas restored and under improved management has been revised. Period of estimated GHG mitigation benefits accruing has been changed to 20 years.

Cleared

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

February 4, 2020

Following bilateral discussions, the areas under improved management practices are now split to be reflected under both CI 3 and 4 for GEF reporting purposes.

January 2020:

I. Revised Carbon calculations are now reflected in the documents submitted. For points a to f above please refer to the calculation and methodology in Annex Ia - Estimated carbon stock in SSF area and Annex Ib - Carbon Stock Estimation in Selected SSF Areas, provided in the package to support the Carbon calculations. These were also bilaterally discussed.

Also note that the restoration is at the landscape level and as discussed would remain in indicator 4 ( reported in the core indicator sheet as well).

-----  
October 2019:

I. Thank you. To improve clarity and accuracy, the team has reworked the calculation using a different approach. The calculation of estimated carbon stock/sink in the SSF Project area used Technical Guidance for Assessing Baseline Emission and GHG Sector for Land Base, (published by the National Development Planning Agency/BAPPENAS, 2014), based on polygon of coverage types for each licensed and indicative area of SSSF. The calculation was based on spatial information from the licensed and indicative areas located in the six targeted districts under the SSF project. Maps produced for each districts indicated polygon coverage types (such as dry land secondary forest, wetland, shrub, plantation, bare land, settlement area etc.) and farmer groups who manage the area (in particular for area under SSF licenses).

To estimate carbon contribution by end of the project (PDO Indicator #3), the project will use assumption that SSF would contribute through restoration of unproductive area (in particular bareland and shrub located in the licensed and indicative area, with total area of 40,534 ha) into more productive area (through plantation, as part of national movement on greening and coverage improvement), with success rate of restoration at 60% (at the age of 3 years), the estimated carbon sink contribution in SSF area would be: 1,094,418 ton CO<sub>2</sub>e (with the assumption that estimated carbon storage in plantation at the age of 3 years is 45 ton CO<sub>2</sub>e/ha, use Bappenas Guideline as reference) – see excel file “eC for restored SSF-revised.xlsx”

Supporting documents for overall data and calculation (consists of estimated carbon stock in the six targeted districts; summary by carbon stock estimation and land coverage) have been submitted.

The project will commence a more thorough carbon calculation as baseline in the first year of implementation as planned originally. It will also be useful to clarify that the earlier calculation was based on a number of assumptions, for example within the HKM (community forestry scheme), the team assumed all area is covered by secondary forests and HTR (community timber plantation scheme) is bareland, as in theory the area is supposed to be the main subject for rehabilitation/reforestation under government program (e.g using social forestry schemes). Similar assumption was taken for the Partnership scheme and Indicative areas (unlicensed area). The Team assumed area under Partnership scheme as agroforestry, while Indicative area was assumed to consist of various type of land coverage depending on the available secondary information. Given these assumptions used in the earlier calculation, a bias potentially resulted in a high estimate on the carbon stock prediction.

Responses to specific comments on the calculation sheet:

1. The headings (HKM, HTR, Partnership, Indicative) are referring to the type of social forestry schemes according to and stipulated in Ministerial regulation (MOEF) No.83/2016 on social forestry: Forestry Partnership, HKM (*Hutan Kemasyarakatan*) or Community Forestry; HTR (*Hutan Tanaman Rakyat*) or Community Plantation Forests; while Indicative is referring to the indicative area allocation for social forestry implementation in certain forest area. Please see detail explanation about these social forestry scheme in Box 1, para #14 and para #15 in the PAD and PID respectively.
2. The prediction of biodiversity status of the proposed SSF project areas is relatively straight forward as the selected areas are located nearby the protected areas or nature reserve. For example: the SSF in Solok District, West Sumatera Province is close to Lembah Harau Nature reserve where most probably an important habitat for critical endangered Sumatran tiger and SSF site in Lampung Selatan which located nearby the protected area where Sumatran gibbon and Sumatran leopard are most probably still occur. As such by improving forest management including restoration ecosystem of degraded SSF areas through re-greening and agroforestry activities it is highly expected the area would be refugee habitat or extended habitat of the said critical endangered wildlife.

3. It is correct, at the time when PDD of SSF is being developed the total area for HKM, HTR and Forestry Partnership area is accounted only 10% of the total SSF target. However, the remaining area or the indicative areas targeted for SSF is located within PIAP (Indicative map and area for social forestry). At the moment these areas are being verified by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry for social forestry purposes.

II. The GOI is fully committed to promote equal participation of women in project activities and the project design incorporates elements to support the women's participation in a meaningful manner. It is however important to emphasize that the final reporting target will be based in the site-specific action plans which are yet to be conducted. These will help determine the exact numbers based on specific activities. As was earlier explained in this response matrix (point 24, pg.12-13; point 12, pg.7; point 27, pg.14), and following further discussion owing to the more recent comments received, although the GOI believes the target achievements are likely to be higher, there decision and request is to keep a conservative realistic target at this stage.

-----  
July 2019: The SSF project would start commencing calculation of emission reduction in year 2 of project implementation. Baseline, however, would be calculated earlier in the first year of project implementation. The Ex-ACT tool can certainly provide an alternative mean to estimate the GHG impact of the projects and would be explored during project implementation. However, as explained in the project document, the calculation of carbon emission was done using FORDIA guidance estimating carbon stock in various type of forest and plantation in Indonesia (latest version of the tool was published in 2014), which is also in line with IPCC Guidance 2012.

The Project used this methodology to calculate the emission reduction by end of the project based on the selected site condition (e.g., type of forest, size of the area, etc.) and projected increase in forest cover by type and area coverage (reference early overall calculation worksheet provided, which estimates numbers at 17MteCO<sub>2</sub>). Given that calculations are based on variable externalities and that the Project will carry out further detail carbon accounting (carbon stock estimation and potential emission reduction) in the selected SSF areas during the first year of project implementation, a lower conservative estimate of 10 MtCO<sub>2</sub> has been included as end target for indicator 3 in agreement with the GoI.

The engagement of women and woman headed households is a priority for the SSF project and for the GOI. The project would focus on getting more women to participate in the SSF project activities and benefit from the opportunity it provides. However, with the cultural context, following extensive discussions with the counterparts, the GOI has suggested to keep a conservative target at this stage rather than 50% that the project considered initially. The end of project targets are likely to be higher and will be reported accordingly.

**7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** N/A

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

06/04/19

The baseline section is missing information on related initiatives with which the project will coordinate. For example, references are made elsewhere in the ProDoc to the Government of Germany's support through KfW, FAO supported projects, and GEF/UNDP implemented projects. The ADB is listed as a co-financier but their relevant initiatives aren't mentioned in the narrative. Further details on these projects/activities and how they contribute to the objectives of the GEF project, and more broadly to the GOI's SSP, would be helpful to ensuring that duplication is avoided and GEF support is based on sound incremental reasoning.

08/02/19

The response provided is helpful but it will be necessary for this information to appear somewhere in the project documents, particularly the baseline section of the PID. Please revise accordingly.

10/23/19

Yes, the project is coordinated with other related initiatives.

Cleared

**Response to Secretariat comments**

Oct 2019: Thank you and noted. The team has revised the baseline section of the PID to better reflect the coordination with other initiatives (see section Baseline, pgs.10-11)

-----

It may be clarified that ADB is not directly providing cofinancing support (refer to Table C of the GEF data sheet). Other development partner supported projects which contribute to the SFP are well coordinated. The FIP-1 (ADB supported), FIP-2 (WB supported) and Gov't of Germany/KfW supported projects are implemented by the DG-Social Forestry which is the same DG that will be implementing the SSF project. All these projects are overseen by the same Director General (DG). The DG has ensured that there is no overlap/duplication of the effort and hence, the geographic focus of these projects are different. However, to ensure that there is a strong synergy and coordination, the MoEF will establish a Project Steering Committee (PSC) which will provide strategic guidance and oversee the progress of both GEF and KfW financed social forestry projects. Furthermore, a Program Coordination Unit (PCU) would also be established that would coordinate and oversee ongoing (and planned) donor supported initiatives to ensure synergy and avoid duplications. The PCU would be financed by the donor supported projects, under the direction of the Director General of Social Forestry.

Regarding FAO supported project, the project is under discussion/identification with the Social Forestry DG. The Bank task team and the FAO team are collaborating to enhance synergy.

Regarding GEF/UNDP supported project, the SSF project contributes to better management of critical habitat which contributes to the GEF/UNDP support project objectives (Para 13 (footnote 20), and 48 Section E).

**9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

06/04/19

Yes, the description includes a component on M&E in which an amount has been budgeted.

Cleared

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

06/04/19

Yes, the project has a sub-component focused on knowledge management.

Cleared

**Response to Secretariat comments****Agency Responses**

**11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:**

**GEFSEC**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

06/04/19

While a Stakeholder Engagement Plan was undertaken during the PPG, the gender assessment found within it is lacking. The assessment only states that the project will ensure women and/or women as household heads will benefit from access to land use rights and livelihood and business development activities that are in line with conservation goals. As assessment of the roles of women in the targeted landscapes and a plan on how best to engage them and address specific needs is missing. Moreover, it's unclear as to why the project targets only 30% participation by women.

08/02/19

Please see point II on the tracking tools question above (#6) and further justify or revise as appropriate.

10/23/19

The response provided on gender inclusion is sufficient at this stage. During the development of site specific action plans, please make sure to maximize outreach and participation of women in project activities and as a beneficiary of outcomes.

Cleared

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

Oct 2019: Response included above.

-----

July 2019: As part of Social Forestry Assessment, specific roles of men and women were reviewed and how they contribute to the project objective. A gender disaggregate PDO level indicator has been agreed also with the GOI to monitor and report project beneficiaries. As per usual practice based on the stakeholder assessment, the site level gender analysis will be conducted as part of project implementation to identify impacts and opportunities, which would enrich subproject design including engagement of men and women specifically to the needs identified.

Regarding the indicator target of 30 percent of the direct beneficiaries as women, please see task team's response above (point 24) under Tracking tools related comments.

### **STAP**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

06/04/19

Yes.

Cleared

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

#### **GEF Council**



**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

06/04/19

Further to the point above, the Germany Council members question on the implication of economics and gender implications derived from restoration related activities needs to be further addressed.

08/02/19

Assurance has been provided that a site level gender analysis will be conducted as part of project implementation and that this will assess the implication of economics and gender derived from sites that implement restoration. Please ensure that this does indeed transpire as planned during the implementation period.

Cleared

**Response to Secretariat comments** In addition to the response earlier provided to the German council comment, as explained above, a site level gender analysis will be conducted as part of project implementation, from which the implication of economics and gender derived from site that implement restoration related activities could be further assessed and adapted within the activities.

**Convention Secretariat**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** N/A

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**Recommendation**

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

No. Please address the comments above.

08/02/19

No, Please address the remaining comments.

10/23/19

No. Please clarify the GHG calculation.

02/04/2020

Yes, the CEO endorsement is recommended.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

February 4, 2020

Following bilateral discussions, the areas under improved management practices are now split to be reflected under both CI 3 and 4 for GEF reporting purposes. Revised CI worksheet has been resubmitted.

January 2020:

Revised GHG calculations are now reflected in the documents and resubmitted, addressing the only pending comment. Also refer to detailed calculation and methodology in Annex Ia - Estimated carbon stock in SSF area and Annex Ib - Carbon Stock Estimation in Selected SSF Areas, provided in the package to support the Carbon calculations. These were also bilaterally discussed.

=====  
Oct 2019: All comments addressed and revised documents addressing and clarifying comments as above, have been resubmitted. Thank you.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**Response to Secretariat comments**

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

#### CEO Recommendation

#### Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

#### OBJECTIVE AND KEY INTERVENTIONS:

Through the “Strengthening of Social Forestry in Indonesia” (SSF) project (9600) the World Bank seeks \$14,317,909 in GEF financing to improve access to forest land use rights and strengthen community management in selected priority areas allocated for social forestry in Indonesia. The project aims to achieve this by providing technical assistance to communities, the Government of Indonesia (GOI), and nongovernmental and community organizations serving as facilitators of social forestry, formalizing land use rights, and supporting activities to restore priority degraded forest lands and improve livelihoods, while generating knowledge and lessons to contribute to the Indonesian government’s Social Forestry Program (SFP). It is structured around three components: 1) Policy and institutional strengthening to support social forestry; 2) Strengthening community management within social forestry; and 3) Project management and M&E. These objectives will be achieved by providing technical assistance to communities, the GOI, and nongovernmental and community organizations serving as facilitators of social forestry, formalizing land use rights, and supporting activities to restore priority degraded forest lands and improve livelihoods, while generating valuable knowledge and lessons to contribute to the Social Forestry Program (SFP). GEF financing will leverage an estimated \$95,113,572 in co-financing.

CONTEXT, BASELINE, INCREMENTAL REASONING: Launched as a policy in 2015 under the Agrarian Reform agenda, the GOI’s Social Forestry Program (SFP) aims to reduce inequality by ensuring the availability of land for members of local communities, including indigenous communities, and the achievement of social justice in the use of forest resources by these communities throughout Indonesia. The 2015 to 2019 Social Forestry target was to award social forestry permits

covering 12.7 million ha, which was expected to be achieved by 2019. To date, the SFP has issued permits covering about 1.72 million ha, and the original target has been reduced to 4.38 million ha to reflect what might realistically be achieved. A new target delivery date of 2024 has been set for accomplishing the 12.7 million ha target.

Under the baseline scenario, progress will continue to be made by the government but at a slower pace than hoped. This GEF-financed SSF project is designed to support the GOI's SFP objectives by: 1) harmonizing sub-national and national policy and regulatory frameworks and strengthening coordination and capacity of government institutions to expedite the implementation of the GOI's SFP; 2) putting in place a mechanism for enhancing the transparency of information on social forestry boundaries by linking to the World Bank's Program to Accelerate Agrarian Reform (in selected sites); 3) developing or strengthening a land information and inventory system that provides consistent and comprehensive information on land claims including indigenous claims inside forest areas and to use the information to resolve land conflicts; 4) providing technical assistance to communities to acquire forest land use permits and then to formulate and implement sustainable forest management plans and enterprise/business development plans; and 5) providing technical assistance to key facilitators of the GOI's SFP, including community-based organizations and non-governmental organizations, so that they can effectively support communities with social forestry schemes. The project would contribute to enhancing forest cover by rehabilitating degraded forest land in selected project areas into well managed forest. Additionally, the GEF-supported activities will incrementally support social forestry activities in private lands that allows the GOI's project to go beyond the boundary of State Forest

**STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT:** Launched as a policy in 2015 under the GOI's Agrarian Reform agenda, the GOI's Social Forested Program is one of Indonesian President Jokowi and the Indonesian Ministry of Environment and Forestry's policy priorities. The overall design of the World Bank's Strengthening of Social Forestry in Indonesia (SSF) project is fully aligned with the objectives of the SFP. The project is also consistent with the Indonesia's Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan of 2015-2020, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The project contributes to the objectives of Indonesia's Biodiversity Action Plan especially through the restoration of degraded forest land and conservation of important forest areas critical for biodiversity such as habitats for iconic Indonesian wildlife. The selected project sites cover areas of high biodiversity value. These include (1) South Lampung District (Kabupaten Lampung Selatan), located close to protection forests, which are habitat for Sumatran clouded leopards (an International Union for Conservation of Nature [IUCN] critically endangered species) and Sumatran gibbons (an Indonesian protected species); (2) Kabupaten Bima dan Dompu, located near the Tambora National Park where Flores hawked eagles (an IUCN critically endangered species) are found; and (3) West Halmahera District (Halmahera Barat), located close to the protection forest of Halmahera where Cockatoo Albas (an IUCN threatened species) are found.

**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT BENEFITS:** GEBs resulting from the project include: 1) 40,452 hectares of land under restoration, 2) 259,548 hectares of landscapes under improved practices; 3) direct GHG emission mitigation of 22,250,982 tCO<sub>2</sub>e over a 20 year period; and 4) 150,000 direct beneficiaries including 45,000 women.