



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>4867</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Indonesia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Enhancing the Protected Area System in Sulawesi (E-PASS) for Biodiversity Conservation</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4392 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1; BD-1; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$6,265,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$43,700,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$49,965,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 01, 2012</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Charlotte Gobin</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Midori Paxton</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	03/26/2012: yes	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	03/26/2012: yes, in a letter dated March 15, 2012. We assume that there is a little shell in second paragraph: instead of UNEP, we should read UNDP.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	03/26/2012: UNDP has an extensive experience in implementing protected areas projects and has a large presence in Indonesia.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	03/26/2012: N/A	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	03/26/2012: Yes, the project fits into the UNDP Country Program Document. The country office will assign an experienced biodiversity conservation program manager.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	03/26/2012: Yes	
	• the focal area allocation?	03/26/2012: N/A	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	03/26/2012: N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	03/26/2012: N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	03/26/2012: N/A	
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?	03/26/2012: N/A	
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	03/26/2012: yes, the project is well aligned with BD focal results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	03/26/2012: yes, the project will address the GEF-5 BD objective 1, outcomes 1-1 and 1-2.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	03/26/2012: yes, the project is fully in line with the National Action Plan for PAs and will support the 2003 Indonesian Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	03/26/2012: No, please provide more details on the type of capacities developed and the targeted actors (including figures).	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address,	03/26/2012: yes, the project provides strong baseline on the on-going activities with their funding and	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	identify the majors gaps. However, at the CEO endorsement phase, more details on the NGOs activities will have to be provided.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	03/26/2012: Yes, the project aims to strengthen the effectiveness and the financial sustainability of PA system by scaling-up the system for biodiversity monitoring and wildlife trade surveillance, by extending PA system and by harmonizing financing strategies with the on-going REDD+ process.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>03/26/2012: Yes, the project framework is sound. However please,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- clarify if the project aims to create new PA, if yes, provide details.</li> <li>- concerning REDD+, GEF funding should be used to scale-up REDD + and not for piloting new ones which GEF has already supported in the past.</li> </ul> <p>Please explain how GEF funding in this project will be used to scale-up REDD + in Sulewasi.</p> <p>Please, fully fill the Focal Area Strategy Framework table.</p> <p>At the CEO endorsement phase, more detail on the various financial mechanisms envisaged will have to be provided.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		03/29/2012: Addressed and more details notably on the MPA extensions, on the financial mechanisms and on the REDD+ scalin-up activities will be provided at the CEO endorsement phase.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	03/26/2012: Yes	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	03/26/2012: It is expected to have more detail information at the CEO endorsement phase.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	03/26/2012: It is expected to have more detail information at the CEO endorsement phase.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	03/26/2012: The key risks are identified and adequate mitigations are proposed at PIF stage.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	03/26/2012: The project gives initial information on related initiatives and proposes to based on their experiences, and coordinate with them, but please provide more details at the CEO endorsement phase.  03/29/2012: Addressed.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	03/26/2012: The project will be led by the Ministry of Forestry, but please provide more details on the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>implementation coordination among the partners.</p> <p>03/29/2012: Addressed, however it is expected to receive further details on the steering committee governance at the CEO endorsement phase.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	03/23/2012: The GEF funding level for the project management cost is about 4,7%, which is appropriate.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>03/23/2012: Please, provide further explanation on the funding and co-funding of the component 3, specifying which kind of investment will be realized and the justifications.</p> <p>03/29/2012: Addressed, however more information on investments using GEF funding will be provided at CEO Endorsement phase.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	03/23/2012: The indicative co-financing ratio is about 1:6,97.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	03/23/2012: PNUD will contribute at a level of US\$2,000,000, in grant.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	03/26/2012: the PIF can not be recommended at this stage, please address the few issues described in the above items.  03/29/2012: All the issues have been well addressed, therefore the PIF is recommended for CEO approval.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	03/26/2012+03/29/2012: Please, ensure that the following issues are addressed at the Request for CEO Endorsement: - Clear and measurable outputs and outcomes are defined - Co-financing is confirmed - Details on investments using the GEF funding are provided - Implementation arrangements with partners and local authorities are well set-up - Activities related to REDD+ scheme are well developed - GEF TT are included	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		- Strong evidence of Global Environmental Benefits and GEF incremental value are presented	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 26, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 29, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.