

Excelling Protected Area Management Effectiveness for Biodiversity Conservation through Landscape Based Approach (ENABLE)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11861

Countries

Indonesia

Project Name

Excelling Protected Area Management Effectiveness for Biodiversity
Conservation through Landscape Based Approach (ENABLE)

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

2/18/2025

Review completed by PM

3/11/2025

Program Manager

Naoko Nakagawa

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Apr 12, 2025

PM Cleared. The new LoE indicates the Ministry of Forestry (MoF) as Executing Partner.

NN Feb 20, 2025

a) Yes.

b) Please ensure that the portal entry of the Executing Partner name, to be consistent with the Letter of Endorsement. The submitted LoE indicates the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) as Executing Entity - while the portal entry if the Ministry of Forestry (MoF). The agency is also requested to secure a new LoE so that it is in the correct format and up to date with the current official name of the Ministry.

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 20, 2025

Yes

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Apr 24, 2025

PM Cleared.

NN Apr 21, 2025

b)

2) Thank you for entering M&E Component instead of Component 4 in the General Overview table in the portal entry.

However, the narrative section still contains reference to Component 4. Please ensure consistency throughout.

Examples:

Component 4. Participatory and gender-responsive Monitoring and Evaluation. Component 4 focuses on establishing a participatory and gender-responsive M&E system to track project effectiveness, support adaptive management, and ensure stakeholder engagement in assessing biodiversity conservation and landscape-based management outcomes.

Gender Equality and Empowerment

Gender equality is essential for achieving sustainable biodiversity conservation and equitable socio-economic development in Indonesia. The project recognizes that women play a crucial role in natural resource management, climate adaptation, and community-led conservation initiatives. To ensure gender inclusivity, the project integrates gender-sensitive approaches in all its activities and tracks progress through the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system (Component 4). The project targets at least 50%

The achievement of the Project Objective—enhancing biodiversity conservation in PAs and surrounding landscapes in Indonesia through an innovative landscape-based management model—is driven by the successful achievement of the four project Outcomes described above. Together, Components 1-4 remove the key barriers to LBM integration—institutional limitations, lack of LBM integration, and limited knowledge exchange—resulting in systemic and transformative change in protected area management across Indonesia.

NN Apr 14, 2025

b)

1) PM Cleared.

2)

i) The indicator "satisfactory rating of the project Quality Assurance supported by MTR and TE" sounds like satisfactory rating is preempted, so, suggest redefining/rephrasing it. It is also advisable to have more periodic M&E activities rather than just relying on MTR and TE. The narrative of these M&E look reasonable, but the indicators (as they appear in the overview Project Components) can be made more tangible. Hope it clarifies.

ii) Please enter it under the M&E Component, rather than under the numbered Component 4, so that M&E Component is clearly demarcated in the portal entry.

1. Building institutional capacity and frameworks for Landscape-based Management via establishing PA Centers of Excellence	2,300,000.00	16,603,200.00
2. Integration of LBM in Gunung Leuser, Sebangau, and Bogani Nani Wartabone National Parks and surrounding landscapes	3,000,000.00	21,661,920.00
3. Enhancing Knowledge Exchange and Scaling up Best LBM Practices Across Indonesia's PA Network	833,236.00	6,010,560.00
4. Participatory and gender-responsive Monitoring and Evaluation	199,479.00	1,440,000.00
M&E		
Subtotal	6,332,715.00	45,715,680.00
Project Management Cost	316,600.00	2,284,320.00
Total Project Cost (\$)	6,649,315.00	48,000,000.00

NN Feb 20, 2025

a) Yes

b)

1) Component 3 - please check if the component 3 title is meant to be "Enhancing Knowledge Exchange and Scaling up Best LBM Practices..", rather than "Scaling of..." as indicated in the PIF.

2) Component 4, the proposed indicators appear rather general and weak. Please consider making tangible indicators. Also, Component 4 is about M&E, while M&E Component is left blank. Suggest removing Component 4 and put it under M & E Component.

Agency's Comments

23 Apr 2025

Thank you for pointing out the inconsistencies. These have been addressed in the revised version of the PIF.

21 Apr 2025

3.1 b) Thank you for the comment on the M&E component. We have now removed this as the numbered Component 4 and included it simply as the M&E Component in the portal and in the PIF. There will be no Component 4, as is reflected in the revised PIF. Please see highlights in blue.

11 Apr 2025

1)

Based on the submitted PIF, it is confirmed that the project would like to facilitate the process of taking best practices from one protected area/national park and replicating or transferring them to other similar contexts. However, the project considers the suggestion to adjust the Component 3 title from ?scaling of? to ?scaling up?. This will ensure broader adoption, replication, and mainstreaming of successful pilots or models.

Then, the new project title is written as follow, p. 4:

*Component 3. Enhancing knowledge exchange and **scaling up** best LBM practices across Indonesia's PA Network*

The Component 3 title has been updated throughout of the PIF

2)

We are unclear on the specifics of this comment. We successfully applied the suggested indicators for other GEF projects, which are Outcome indicators as required for the project GEF logical framework. We are ready to discuss it further after your clarification. However, we added the third indicator for the Component 4 as the following, p.5:

>=50% of participants of the project M&E activities are women

Yes, the Component 4 is a M&E Component. That is correct.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Apr 21, 2025

PM Cleared. Mismatch revised.

NN Apr 14, 2025

1) Most of the previous mismatched are updated to 'gender-responsive', but the below SDG section still contains 'gender-inclusive'. Please ensure consistency.

Project contribution to SDGs

SDG	Direct contribution
SDG 1 (No Poverty)	By promoting sustainable livelihoods through eco-tourism, agroforestry, and conservation-based enterprises, the project supports income generation for local communities.
SDG 2 (Zero Hunger)	It enhances food security by integrating sustainable agriculture and agroforestry practices into protected area management and adjacent landscapes.
SDG 5 (Gender Equality)	The project ensures <u>gender-inclusive</u> conservation governance, empowering women in decision-making and benefit-sharing in biodiversity management

2) Addressed/PM cleared.

NN Mar 10, 2025 / VL Mar 13, 2025

1) In the Indicative Project Overview Table, Component 4 M&E indicates gender-inclusive M&E, while the Outcome refers to gender-responsive M&E. Is this differentiation intended? If not, suggest having a consistent approach. In the project narrative, there are also mismatches found.

2) Gender equality considerations have not been adequately integrated throughout the project. Please integrate gender perspectives and interventions to promote women's leadership, participation and empowerment in all the project components.

Agency's Comments

21 Apr 2025

3.2. This has been amended. Please see highlights in blue.

11 Apr 2025

1) Thank you for highlighting the inconsistency regarding the terminology used in Component 4 (Monitoring & Evaluation) of the submitted Project Identification Form (PIF) for the ENABLE project.

The differentiation between 'gender-inclusive M&E' in the Indicative Project Overview Table and 'gender-responsive M&E' in the Outcome statement and project narrative was not intentional. Recognizing the importance of clarity and consistency, we propose to uniformly adopt the term "**gender-responsive Monitoring and Evaluation**" throughout the document.

2) Thank you for highlighting the need for better integration of gender equality considerations in the project components of the ENABLE project.

Gender considerations have been added in all project Outputs, pp. 22-25. For example, for Output 1.1:

Gender mainstreaming will be integrated into these criteria and guidelines to ensure equitable participation and benefits for women and men in landscape-based conservation initiatives.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 9, 2025

a) Yes.

b) Yes, both around 5%.

c) Yes, around 5%.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 20, 2025

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Apr 15, 2025

d) Addressed/PM Cleared.

NN Mar 10, 2025 / OP Mar 13, 2025

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

d) Not sufficiently. Key Stakeholders are only generically mentioned without specific institutions/groups names and there is no evidence if/how the stakeholders were consulted during the PIF formulation. Please identify key stakeholders with organizations/group names

and their indicative role in the proposed projects, their potential interest in the project, and indicate any consultations held during the PIF formulation phase.

Agency's Comments

11 Apr 2025

d) Thank you for highlighting the need for clearer identification and roles of key stakeholders in the PIF. The Key Stakeholders section of the PIF was strengthened with a brief information on the stakeholders and their roles in the project, p. 26:

Key stakeholders identified and consulted during the PIF formulation include:

1. **Ministry of Forestry (MoF):** Responsible for overall project execution, policy guidance, and coordination among PAs. Consulted extensively to align with national biodiversity strategies and policy frameworks.
2. **National Park Authorities (Gunung Leuser, Sebangau, Bogani Nani Wartabone, Kerinci Seblat, Bukit Barisan Selatan, Lamandau Wildlife Reserve, Nyiut Penrissen Nature Reserve, Rawa Aopa Watumohai, and Bunaken):** Direct implementers of landscape-based management (LBM) activities; participated actively in formulation discussions to define roles and responsibilities.
3. **Local Governments of Aceh, North Sumatra, Central Kalimantan, Gorontalo, and North Sulawesi Provinces:** Engaged to integrate project interventions with regional development plans and to ensure institutional support.
4. **Local Communities,** represented through local organizations (e.g., Lembaga Adat, community forums): Engaged through preliminary consultations to identify livelihood opportunities and community-managed conservation agreements.
5. **NGOs and CSOs** including Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Forum Konservasi Leuser (FKL), Yayasan Ekosistem Lestari (YEL), and Burung Indonesia: Consulted to leverage expertise, field experiences, and ensure alignment with ongoing conservation initiatives.
6. **Research Institutions and Universities** (e.g., IPB University, University of Indonesia, Universitas Syiah Kuala, Universitas Palangka Raya, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo): Identified to support applied research, training, knowledge management, and capacity-building programs.
7. **Private Sector Partners** (e.g., eco-tourism businesses, sustainable agroforestry enterprises): Engaged to explore potential partnerships for sustainable financing, livelihood diversification, and market access.

See other details in the **ANNEX H: KEY Stakeholder Groups for the project development and implementation**

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 10, 2025

1) Yes

2) Yes

Agency's Comments

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 10, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Apr 21, 2025

a) PM Cleared.

NN Apr 15, 2025

a) Please rephrase so that the project will be "executed", rather than "implemented", by the MOF... so that it is harmonized with the GEF policy segregating execution and implementation functions.

b) Addressed/PM Cleared.

NN March 6, 2025

a) Not sufficiently. Please provide description of institutional setting, including potential executing partners.

b) GEF policies, further explained in the Guidelines on Project and Program Cycle, require that the separation of implementation functions performed by GEF Agencies and execution functions performed by Project Executing Entities is a key feature of the governance of the GEF Partnership and an important aspect of the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards.?

See

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf. *(pages 44-45)*

At PIF stage, Agency (?dual?) execution should not be included in the Agency's proposal. Once the Agency has sufficiently progressed in project preparation and if it anticipates a need for Agency execution, the Agency would submit full information and justification for a request for policy exception. Therefore, at PIF stage, GEF agency execution should not be preempted. Accordingly, please indicate No, for agency execution in the portal entry.

Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

Does the GEF Agency expect to play an execution role on this project? Yes

If so, please describe that role here. Also, please add a short explanation to describe cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects, including potential for co-location and/or sharing of expertise/staffing

The project will be implemented in strong coordination and collaboration with other relevant programs and projects in the country and South-East Asia Region to ensure (1) Resource Optimization, including funding, expertise, and manpower, to avoid duplication of efforts and obtain co-financing; (2) Knowledge and Experience Sharing to enhance the effectiveness of each project, leading to more innovative and well-rounded solutions; and (3) Synergy in objectives to amplify their impact, making it easier to achieve these shared objectives on a larger scale. Specifically, the project will directly collaborate with the following initiatives:

Please also remove the below reference to UNDP CO support services included in the Fiduciary Risk.

Fiduciary	Moderate	There is a risk that the MoF might face challenges in managing the funds and making procurement for the project. This is due to their official regional ministerial tasks they need to complete with limited number of staff. This might post delays in the implementation of project activities. To mitigate these risks, the project will strengthen financial oversight mechanisms,
-----------	----------	--

2/18/2025

Page



	enforce transparent budget reporting, integrate fiduciary risk assessments, project audits, and establish anti-corruption training for PA financial managers. The MoF as Implementing Partner will receive support services from UNDP CO under the NIM arrangement.
--	---

c) Yes.

d) Yes.

Agency's Comments

21 Apr 2025

5.3 a) This has been corrected. Please see highlight in blue.

11 Apr 2025

a) The following has been added to the **Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects**, p. 29:

The project will be implemented by the Ministry of Forestry (MoF), specifically through its Directorate General of Natural Resources and Ecosystem Conservation (KSDAE), as the Implementing Partner under supervision/oversight by UNDP.

b) We confirm that at this PIF stage, agency execution is not anticipated and will not be preempted. Accordingly, we indicated 'No' for agency execution in the portal entry. Should there be any future consideration necessitating GEF Agency execution, we will provide full information and justification for a request for policy exception in alignment with GEF policies.

We have removed the reference that read "The MoF as Implementing Partner will receive support services from UNDP CO under the NIM arrangement."

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Apr 15, 2025

a) b) PM Cleared. Explanation provided not to include CI 3.

NN Mar 9, 2025

a) We suggest the agency to consider also estimating targets for Core Indicator 3, considering there are some project activities on restoration, and also considering that the PIF proposes Rio markets to include Land Degradation as Significant Objective (1). If the agency decides to do so, please consider including restoration as part of co-benefits described in the narrative.

b) Yes for CI 1, CI 2, CI 4 and CI 11 that are proposed. If/once CI 3 is proposed, it will also be reviewed.

Agency's Comments

11 Apr 2025

- a) We fully acknowledge and appreciate your recommendation. We have explicitly included restoration activities as part of the co-benefits described in the project narrative (Page 20 of the PIF). In its current formulation, and as discussed with key in-country stakeholders including the IP, the project's restoration activities are not expected to be significant enough to report against a core indicator. All restoration activities undertaken will be at the community level and aim to sustain key biodiversity by creating corridors for threatened species and mitigating edge effects and improving climate change resilience in and around protected areas- as such the expected biodiversity outcomes are captured within core indicators 1 and 4.
- b) Yes, based on the project's focus and described activities, it is correct and appropriate that Core Indicators (CI) 1 (Terrestrial protected areas), CI 2 (Marine protected areas), CI 4 (Area of landscapes under improved practices), and CI 11 (Direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender) are proposed.

We fully acknowledge and appreciate your recommendation. However, based on discussions and preferences expressed by the executing agency, the project's focus will remain primarily aligned with biodiversity-related core indicators, specifically CI 1; CI 2, CI 4, and CI 11.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

- a) **Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?**
- b) **Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) **Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments

NN Apr 15, 2025

Thank you for the updates and revised texts.

- 1) PM Cleared.
- 2) PM Cleared.
- 3) PM Cleared.

NN Mar 10, 2025

- 1) In the Risk Table, please insert the explanation of risk and mitigation measures for Environmental and Social Risk in the table, rather than only referring to Annex D.
- 2) Under Fiduciary Risk, UNDP CO support services is indicated. Such UNDP dual execution should not be preempted at PIF stage. Please remove reference on UNDP CO support service.
- 3) On Financial and Business Model risk, the mitigation measures indicated are "the MoF should develop conservation finance mechanism for PAs...". However, it does not explain what if the MoF does not develop such mechanism. It is not explained whether MoF would do so from its own government program, or with the proposed project. Please revise the mitigation measures that are feasible to manage under the project's control.

Agency's Comments

11 Apr 2025

- 1) Noted.

The project Social and Environmental risks have been added to the Key Risks table (**ANNEX I: Project risks, p. 75**) as the following:

*The project has identified substantial social and environmental risks, including inadequate stakeholder capacity potentially affecting protected area management effectiveness, exclusion of marginalized groups, exacerbation of land use conflicts, insufficient gender integration potentially leading to gender discrimination or gender-based violence, inequitable distribution of project benefits risking elite capture, and potential adverse impacts on Customary Peoples' rights and lands. **To address these risks**, the project will undertake comprehensive stakeholder analyses, scoped Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIA) and Strategic Environmental and Social Assessments (SESA), capacity assessments, conflict sensitivity*

assessments, gender analyses, and customary peoples' screenings. Mitigation measures include developing robust Environmental and Social Management Frameworks (ESMF), Stakeholder Engagement Plans (SEP), Gender Action Plans (GAP), Livelihood Action Frameworks, Customary Peoples Planning Frameworks, Capacity Development Plans, and Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRM), ensuring active participation and benefit sharing for all stakeholders, especially vulnerable groups, women, and Customary Peoples.

Also, we made a similar summary for climate risks:

*The project is exposed to several climate risks including increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events, shifting precipitation patterns, rising temperatures, and sea-level rise, which could adversely affect biodiversity, ecosystems, and local livelihoods. To mitigate these risks, the project integrates climate-resilient practices into its landscape-based management models. **Key mitigation measures include** enhancing habitat connectivity to support species migration and adaptation, restoring degraded ecosystems to enhance resilience, and promoting diversified and climate-smart livelihood opportunities for local communities. Additionally, the project employs adaptive management strategies based on continuous climate risk assessments and stakeholder engagement, ensuring that interventions remain effective under changing climatic conditions. Capacity-building efforts focused on climate awareness and adaptation techniques will further empower local communities and stakeholders to proactively manage climate-related challenges.*

2) Noted. The mentioned reference is now removed from the PIF.

3) Kindly find below the proposed revision on project Financial and Business Model risks and mitigation measures (all the measures are mentioned in the project Outputs):

*Dependence on government funding, which currently covers only 70% of required conservation budgets, and limited private sector investment may lead to financial shortfalls, unsustainable PA management, and delays in implementing conservation programs. **To mitigate the risks**, each CoE will have a Financial Sustainability Strategy including financial mechanisms ensuring sustainable operations in the mid-term and long-term; Management Plans of Gunung Leuser, Sebangau, and Bogani Nani Wartabone National Parks will explicitly include a Financial Sustainability Plan with strategies to secure diversified and sustainable funding source; the project will work on establishment of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) to facilitate investments in ecotourism, sustainable agriculture, and*

biodiversity-friendly enterprises, creating economic incentives and private sector engagement for conservation; updated management plans for six additional national parks/reserves will explicitly integrate financial sustainability strategies for long-term implementation of landscape-based management models

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Apr 15, 2025

PM Cleared.

NN Mar 9, 2025

Please ensure that the correct names of the Ministries are used. In the PIF, there many indications are made to "Ministry of Forestry" but indications are also made to "Ministry of Environment and Forestry". It is understood that the Ministry has changed names from time to time, and please ensure that the correct ones are used, or add a short note to clarify (e.g., indicate the name of the Ministry at the time of the relevant project's official approval, and provide the current name if it changed, etc.).

Agency's Comments

11 Apr 2025

We confirm that as of October 2024, the "Ministry of Environment and Forestry" was officially separated into two distinct ministries: the "Ministry of Forestry" and the "Ministry of Environment." For this project, the responsible institution is the "Ministry of Forestry." All references to the ministry within the PIF will be revised accordingly and consistently reflect "Ministry of Forestry." Additionally, this update will be clearly reflected in the revised Letter of Endorsement (LoE).

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 10, 2025

Yes, to BD-1.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 10, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Apr 15, 2025

PM Cleared.

NN Mar 9, 2025 / VL Mar 13, 2025

Please include KMGBF Target 23, "Ensure Gender Equality and a Gender-Responsive Approach for Biodiversity Action", if the project plans to integrate gender equality considerations.

Agency's Comments

11 Apr 2025

Thank you. GBF Target 23 added to the section **C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming strategies and country/regional priorities**, p. 32 as the following:

Target 23 - Gender Equality and a Gender-Responsive Approach for Biodiversity Action: The project contributes to the target by systematically integrating gender considerations, equitable participation, capacity-building, and benefit-sharing for women and men across all outputs, ensuring gender-responsive biodiversity management and conservation practices in Indonesia's protected areas.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Apr 15, 2025

PM Cleared.

NN Mar 9, 2025 / IM Mar 13, 2025

There is no evidence of stakeholder consultations. Please provide them.

In particular, please provide evidence of consultation with IPLCs and other vulnerable groups to identify their needs and how their needs are integrated into the project design/concept at PIF stage.

Agency's Comments

11 Apr 2025

The updated stakeholder consultation table with discussions with local communities are uploaded to the PIF and included in the ANNEX G: Stakeholders involved in the PIF development, pp 73-75.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 9. 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 9, 2025

Yes.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's CommentsYes

Agency's Comments
8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments
NN Mar 9, 2025

Yes at PIF stage.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Apr 15, 2025

PM Cleared. New LoE uploaded.

NN Feb 20, 2025

Yes. However, please correct the format as per below.

Agency's Comments

11 Apr 2025

Please find the revised LoE for reference.

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Feb 20, 2025

Yes

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Apr 15, 2025

PM cleared. New LoE uploaded.

NN Feb 20, 2025

The submitted Letter of Endorsement is outdated, signed on August 27, 2024. It is also missing the texts referring to the GEF project financing Agency Fee and PPG Agency Fee.

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area Source	Amount (in US\$)				
			GEF Project Financing	GEF Project Financing	Project Preparation Grant	Project Preparation Grant (PPG)	Total
GEFTF	UNDP	BD STAR Allocation	6,649,315	631,685	200,000	19,000	7,500,000
Total GEF Resources			6,649,315	631,685	200,000	19,000	7,500,000

OFPs are encouraged to include a four-month validity period for LOEs, from the date when the LoE is issued.

When resubmitting the revised PIF, please include a new Letter of Endorsement signed by OFP, with correct formatting.

Please also ensure that the correct current name of the Ministry's name is indicated and consistent in the new/revised OFP LoE and portal entry of the Executing Entity.

Agency's Comments

11 Apr 2025

The LoE is updated following the comments.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Apr 15, 2025

PM cleared.

NN Feb 20, 2025 / IM Mar 13, 2025

We note that UNDP attached the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) with grievance redress mechanism. The project is classified the ESS risk as high/substantial risk.

There is no evidence of identification and consultation of vulnerable communities including IPLCs. Please provide evidence of consultation with IPLCs and other vulnerable groups to identify their needs and how their needs are integrated into the project design/concept at PIF stage.

Agency's Comments

11 Apr 2025

The updated stakeholder consultation table with discussions with local communities are uploaded to the PIF and included in the ANNEX G: Stakeholders involved in the PIF development, pp 73-75.

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Apr 12, 2025

PM Cleared. CCM and LD Rio markers are changed to 0.

NN Mar 9, 2025

Biodiversity being the Principal Objective (2) is agreeable.

For Climate Change Mitigation, since the project does not propose CI 6 GHG emission reduction, nor the project activities targeted for such, we suggest downgrading it to zero, rather than Significant Objective (1).

Agency's Comments

11 Apr 2025

Agreed. We adjusted Climate Change Mitigation Rio Marker to 0. ANNEX E: Rio Markers, p. 66

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Mar 10, 2025

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

NN Apr 24, 2025

The project is recommended for technical clearance.

NN Apr 21, 2025

Please address comment 3.1 (b) which still contains inconsistency in the narrative and resubmit.

NN Apr 15, 2025

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments 3.1 (b), 3.2, 5.3 (a), and resubmit.

NN /OP Mar 13, 2025

Not at this time. Please address comments above and resubmit.

Agency's Comments

23 Apr 2025

The inconsistencies have been addressed in the current version. Thank you.

21 Apr 2025

All the comments have been addressed.

11 Apr 2025

We have addressed all the comments.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

VL Mar 13, 2025

- 1) Please ensure to include relevant gender-specific indicators in the Results Framework;
- 2) In the development of the Gender Action Plan, please include specific budget lines, as appropriate and plans for monitoring and reporting on the GAP.
- 3) Under M&E, please reflect that reports submitted (MTR and TE) include gender-specific results and progress in the implementation of the gender action plan.

Agency's Comments

11 Apr 2025

Thank you for your valuable recommendations on gender mainstreaming for the future Project Preparation Grant (PPG). We acknowledge your guidance and confirm the following:

Results Framework: We will ensure the inclusion of relevant gender-specific indicators within the Results Framework. These indicators will enable clear tracking and assessment of gender-related impacts and achievements throughout project implementation.

Gender Action Plan (GAP): In developing the GAP, we will explicitly incorporate specific budget lines, where appropriate, to adequately resource planned gender activities. Additionally, the GAP will include clear mechanisms for systematic monitoring and periodic reporting on progress.

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E): We will reflect explicitly in the project's M&E arrangements that the Mid-Term Review (MTR) and Terminal Evaluation (TE) reports include detailed gender-specific results and assess progress in the implementation of the GAP.

We appreciate your guidance and will integrate these points diligently during the PPG to enhance gender responsiveness and accountability in the project.

1)

The positions above have been reflected in the description of the Output 4.2, p. 26.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/10/2025	4/11/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/15/2025	4/21/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/21/2025	4/24/2025

	PIF Review	Agency Response
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/24/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)		