



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Transforming effectiveness of biodiversity conservation in priority Sumatran landscapes			
Country(ies):	Indonesia	GEF Project ID: ¹	4892
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5363
Other Executing Partner(s):	Department for Forest Protection and Nature Conservation (PHKA) , Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Sumatran Tiger Conservation Forum (known as HarimauKita), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Fauna & Flora International (FFI)and Zoological Society of London (ZSL)	Submission Date:	December 19, 2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	72
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	900,000
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 		

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD1	1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.	1. Existing or New protected areas (5) and coverage (8.18m hectares) of unprotected ecosystems. 2. Existing or New protected areas (5) and coverage (8.18m hectares) of the 5 main sub-populations of the Critically Endangered Sumatran tiger and wider biodiversity.	GEF	8,008,300	45,625,416
BD1	1.2: Increased revenue for protected areas to meet total expenditures required for management.	3. Sustainable financing plans (5).	GEF	581,700	6,824,584
Project Mgt Cost			GEF	410,000	1,000,000.00
Total project costs				9,000,000	53,450,000

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To enhance biodiversity conservation in priority landscapes in Sumatra through adoption of best management practices in protected areas and adjacent production landscapes, using tiger recovery as a key indicator of success						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Increased effectiveness of key protected area management institutions	TA	<p>Improved management effectiveness of 5 priority PAs, covering 3,185,359 ha, through ongoing implementation of best practice adaptive management plans, indicated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in the Capacity Development Scorecard for each target PAs; ▪ Reduction of tiger-related threats by >10% in each of the 5 target PAs indicated by a reduction in the number of illegal activities as shown in SMART-RBM monthly patrolling reports; ▪ Increase in law enforcement patrol effort (km walked per year) by >10% in each of the 5 target PAs as shown in SMART-RBM monthly patrolling reports ▪ Forest degradation rates in core areas in 5 target protected areas reduced to <1% by end of project [<i>baseline to be set in Project Year 1</i>] ▪ Improved METT scores for the 5 target PAs <p><i>Please refer to the Strategic Results Framework for baseline and targets.</i></p>	<p>1.1. Management capacity increased in target protected areas through training and technical assistance, including application of competency standard to improve human resource development, staff performance and training.</p> <p>1.2. Enhanced management and annual plans developed, adopted and implemented for target NPs. This will include integration of National Tiger Recovery Plan priority actions.</p> <p>1.3. Adaptive management law enforcement tools and standards, such as SMART, are implemented in priority RBMs in target landscapes.</p> <p>1.4. Management effectiveness increase annually tracked through training results and METT assessments.</p> <p>1.5. Updated version of the National Tiger Recovery Plan and Sumatran Tiger Strategy and Action Plan developed and adopted.</p>	GEF TF	4,562,750	27,353,949
2. Inter-sectoral coordination systems are developed	TA	Increased coordination between key stakeholders operating in priority areas and improved viability and replicability of innovative forest and biodiversity management interventions, resulting in an	2.1. Landscape-level and inter-landscape partnerships developed and operationalized between relevant agencies concerned with illegal wildlife trade.	GEF TF	3,445,550	18,271,467

for priority landscapes		<p>integrated, more cost-effective approach to biodiversity conservation, indicated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in the number of wildlife crime cases submitted for prosecution from operations conducted at island level as a result of intersectoral collaboration increases by >25%; ▪ Increase in the number of various agency staff (e.g. MoEF, Provincial/ District level authorities and/or regional development planning authorities such as Pappeda and Public Works) participating in the process of piloting five innovative forest/ biodiversity projects ▪ Development and operationalization of standardised tiger, prey and forest habitat monitoring system for 5 target protected areas and their surrounding landscapes ▪ >95% of human-tiger conflict reports are correctly assessed and/or responded in accordance with PHKA mitigation protocol <p><i>Please refer to the Strategic Results Framework for baseline and more details on the target.</i></p>	<p>2.2 Innovative forest and wildlife management interventions in target landscapes documented and reviewed for replication and upscaling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Community Carbon Pool-Village Forest (Hutan Desa) scheme buffering Kerinci Seblat NP (supported by FFI) b) Priority wildlife habitat conserved in production area for Kampar (supported by FFI) c) Village forest restoration in Berbak NP (supported by ZSL, TFCA project) d) ‘Smart Green Infrastructure’ guidelines towards roads evaluated and tailored or tiger landscapes, in cooperation with GTI (supported by HarimauKita). e) Development of sustainable agricultural commodities in Bukit Barisan Selatan and Gunung Leuser National Parks (supported by WCS) <p>2.3 Management decision-making informed through wildlife and forest monitoring using a standardised scientific survey protocol.</p> <p>2.4 Human-tiger conflicts effectively managed in five target landscapes.</p>			
3. Sustainable financing for biodiversity management in priority landscapes	TA	<p>New sustainable financing mechanisms to meet long-term management expenditure needs for protected areas developed in priority landscapes with the potential to replicate successful models elsewhere in Sumatra and Indonesia, indicated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development and implementation of 5 new financing plans for selected target PAs and budgets increased by 10%. ▪ Increase by >25% for each of the three component scores in the Financial Sustainability Scorecard for the sub-system of Sumatra’s protected areas <p>Public-private partnerships piloted in high biodiversity sites adjacent</p>	<p>3.1. Financial sustainability analysis conducted to improve cost-effectiveness, disbursement mechanisms and budget resources for National Park authorities (UPT): identification of PA management costs, non-state revenue generation opportunities including market mechanisms will be identified, 5 financing plans for target PAs developed and implementation supported.</p> <p>3.2. Sustainable financing plans developed and implemented for selected production areas through business and biodiversity mechanisms, creating enabling conditions for ecosystem restoration</p>	GEF TF	581,700	6,824,584

	to protected areas to support biodiversity-friendly land use within priority landscapes, indicated by: development and implementation of Two sustainable financing plans for production area/s through business and biodiversity mechanisms (PES, private sector endowment and corporate social responsibility schemes and biodiversity offsetting) involving public-private partnerships <i>Please refer to the Strategic Results Framework for baseline and more details on the target.</i>	concessions, conservation of high conservation value forest in plantations and other pro-environment initiatives in production forests that directly support PA institutions. 3.3. Institutional framework at national level adopted to support sustainable financing scheme implementation, including a thorough review of laws, regulations and policies, and removal of identified barriers to increased revenue flow to PAs.			
Subtotal				8,590,000	52,450,000
Project management Cost (PMC) ³			GEF TF	410,000	1,000,000
Total project costs				9,000,000	53,450,000

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	MOEF - PHKA	In-kind ⁴	44,100,000
CSO	FFI	In-kind	2,300,000
CSO	WCS	In-kind	2,250,000
CSO	ZSL	In-kind	1,000,000
CSO	Forum Harimaukita	In-kind	150,000
Private Sector	APRIL	Cash	3,500,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	150,000
Total Co-financing			53,450,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF	Biodiversity	Indonesia	9,000,000	900,000	9,900,000
Total Grant Resources				9,000,000	900,000	9,900,000

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

⁴ In-kind co-financing includes amounts that will be invested through baseline projects.

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	0	0	0
National/Local Consultants	0	0	0

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No.

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁵

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc

No significant changes.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

No change in GEF focal area. However, the scope of the project has been revised from Biodiversity Objective 1 plus Objective 2 to focusing purely on Objective 1. This allows a stronger focus on strengthening the management effectiveness and financial sustainability of the five targeted protected areas, some of which are very large (Kerinci Seblat NP is 1,389,500 ha, and Gunung Leuser NP is 1,094,692 ha) and face significant challenges from encroachment and poaching. The second component of the project still addresses the wider landscapes beyond the PA boundaries, and will strengthen inter-agency coordination for habitat and wildlife protection, targeting control of tiger poaching, illegal wildlife trade and management of human-tiger conflicts. It will also support pilot activities in production landscapes through cofinanced project partner initiatives that demonstrate public-private partnerships and the development of innovative financing mechanisms for conservation. In addition, management decision-making will be informed through wildlife and forest monitoring using a standardised scientific survey protocol including these wider landscapes.

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

UNDP is providing US\$ 150,000 cash co-financing to this project. UNDP has a major biodiversity and ecosystem programme under its Biodiversity and Ecosystems Global Frameworks for the period 2012-2020. Under the three signature programmes, namely biodiversity mainstreaming in development planning and production sector activities, unlocking the potential of protected areas, and ecosystem based adaptation and mitigation, UNDP support the majority of the 13 tiger range countries. UNDP, as a partner for the Global Tiger Initiative and direct contribution towards the Global Tiger Recovery Programme, has supported and currently supporting 14 tiger landscapes in 10 countries. In Indonesia, UNDP has a large country presence and, in its country operations, the project fits within the UNDAF (2011 – 2015), in particular, Outcome 5 Strengthened climate change mitigation and adaptation and environmental sustainability measures in targeted vulnerable provinces, sectors and communities, Sub-Outcome 11: Strengthened capacity for effective climate change mitigation and adaptation, including ecosystems and natural resources management and energy efficiency. UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD), covering 2011-2015, in particular Country Programme Outcome 2.1. Enhanced capacity of GOI to manage natural resources and energy. Under the Country Programme, UNDP has a number of projects and programmes including the Sustainable Palm Oil Programme, a US\$ 35million comprehensive programme with the Ministry of Agriculture, UKP4 and Ministry of Forestry, which is currently being finalised with support from the UNDP Green Commodity Facility. The UNDP

⁵ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

has supported REDD+ readiness through the UN-REDD Programme, as well as the formation and running of the government's REDD+ Task Force. Furthermore, UNDP has well established mechanisms for partnering with the GoI and every UNDP project is implemented in collaboration with the GoI. Consequently, these bring a strong ownership of the project by the GoI. UNDP is still perceived as a neutral player, respected by civil society organizations, with well-established project management mechanisms and full technical resources, thereby making the project implementation smooth in the field with a transparent and participatory manner. The UNDP Country Office (CO) will assign a technical specialist within the Energy and Environment Unit, guided by the head of the Unit and supported by the alternate staff, administrative assistant, and the UNDP finance office. The UNDP Regional Technical Adviser based in Bangkok will provide technical support to the CO for implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

No significant change beyond the shift in emphasis towards Biodiversity Objective 1 (management effectiveness and financial sustainability of protected area systems) described above.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCE/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCE/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

No significant change in incremental reasoning or the global environmental benefits to be delivered. No significant change in incremental reasoning or the global environmental benefits to be delivered. Some minor changes are change in the project duration and shifting of some outcome level indicators. Duration of the project is now 6 years compared to 5 years indicated in the PIF. This is to allow a minimum of full 5-years for actual project implementation period, as well as an ample amount of time for a thorough project inception phase including project staff recruitment and establishment of the management structure. As noted in footnote 3, the previously suggested outcome indicator "increase in Sumatran tiger density by >10% in core landscape areas" for component 2 has been elevated to be an objective level indicator as shown in the Strategic Results Framework. The tiger poaching reduction and deforestation.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

The risk assessment in the PIF has been reviewed and updated taking into account the Environmental and Social Screening Procedure (see the **Project Risk Log** in **Table 10**, and **ESSP** in **Annex 5** of the Project Document). One new risk was identified and mitigation measures proposed - exploitation of tigers and forest products dramatically increase due to heightened international trade that puts the control of these drivers of change beyond the project's intervention. Other risks were updated, for example to take account of developments in 2014 concerning the continued listing of the WHC site Tropical Forest Heritage of Sumatra as a *World Heritage Site in Danger*. The project's intervention will assist the Government of Indonesia in responding positively to this situation through strengthening management effectiveness at the concerned sites and reducing threats.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives was updated from the PIF, especially taking into account coordination with the UNDP/GEF E-PASS Project (Enhancing the Protected Area System in Sulawesi for Biodiversity Conservation) which has similar objectives focusing on the Sulawesi portion of the national protected area system, and the UNEP/GEF RIMBA project (Strengthening forest and ecosystem connectivity in the RIMBA landscape [in central Sumatra] through investing in natural capital, biodiversity and GHG emissions reduction). The shift towards a stronger emphasis on protected area management in the present project took account of the RIMBA project's focus on biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource management in production landscapes and is intended to reduce the potential for overlap between these two complementary projects, which share the same NEA (MoEF).

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

The Stakeholder Involvement Plan from the Project Document is as follows:

Information dissemination and consultation during the PPG

The project has been designed through a participatory process that is in line with UNDP and GEF requirements. The PPG phase included consultations with the project's key stakeholders at the national, subnational and local levels.

Two national level consultation meetings were first held,

- The project 'Kick-off' meeting was held in Jakarta on 7 May 2014. Opened by Pk Agus Sutito (Deputy Head of Biodiversity Conservation, *PHKA*) and followed Midori Paxton (UNDP, Regional Technical Advisor) and Crawford Prentice (UNDP Project Development Consultant) who explained the aims, objectives, and core design of the GEF project and the PPG process. There were >20 participants from MoEF (national and subnational), *Bappenas*, UNDP, *HarimauKita*, WCS, ZSL and FFI.
- A follow up meeting, which acted as a pre-cursor to the site visits, was held with *PHKA* in Jakarta on 1 July 2014 to socialise the project design (including high level components and different implementation modalities), timeline for its development and anticipated implementation thereafter, GEF BD1 tracking tool and UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard, the ESSP process and key issues identified during the initial assessment, and the purpose and plan for the site-level stakeholder consultations. The meeting was designed to allow for participant discussion and input into each item. There were 52 participants from MoEF (national and subnational), *Bappenas*, UNDP, *HarimauKita*, WCS, ZSL and FFI.

The potential stakeholders to consult during site visits were identified through these two meetings, informal *PHKA*-NGO meetings thereafter, and the initial ESSP assessment. Next, for each of the target landscapes, visits were conducted by a project preparation team consisting of personnel from *PHKA*, FFI, WCS, ZSL and *HarimauKita*. Subnational consultation workshops held with local stakeholders were convened as follows (see Project Document **Annex 4**):

- For the Kerinci Seblat landscape, the workshop was conducted on 14-15 August in Kerinci, Jambi. There were 31 participants from 15 relevant organisations from three provinces, including *PHKA* (national, NP and *BKSDA*) *Dishut*, Police, local NGOs, FFI, *HarimauKita* and a women's group (*Aliansi Perempuan Merangin*).
- For the Gunung Leuser landscape, the workshop was conducted on 13 August 2014 in Medan. There were 41 participants from 19 relevant organizations, including *PHKA* (national, NP, *BKSDA*), *Dishut*, subdistrict governments, local NGOs, WCS, VESWIC and private sector.
- For the Bukit Barisan Selatan landscape, the workshop was conducted on 15 August 2014 at in Lampung. There were 35 participants from 19 relevant organizations, including *PHKA* (national, NP, *BKSDA*), *Dishut*, *Bina Marga*, *BAPPEDA*, subdistrict governments, local NGOs, WCS, *HarimauKita*, *Konsorsium UNILA-PILI* and private sector.
- For the Berbak-Sembilang landscape, a workshop was conducted for each national park. The Berbak workshop was conducted on 15 August 2014 in Jambi. There were 39 participants from 22 relevant organisations, including *PHKA* (national, NP and *BKSDA*) *Dishut*, *BPDAS*, subdistrict and village representatives, local NGOs, ZSL, *HarimauKita*, private sector and the University of Jambi. Next, the Sembilang workshop was conducted on 19th August 2014 in Palembang. There were 43 participants from 20 relevant organisations, including *PHKA* (national, NP and *BKSDA*) *Dishut*, *BPDAS*, provincial Police, subdistrict and village representatives, local NGOs, ZSL, *HarimauKita*, private sector, donor agencies (GIZ and JICA) and Sriwijaya University.
- For the Kampar landscape, the workshop was conducted on 11-12 August in Riau. There were 33 participants from 12 relevant organisations, including *PHKA* (national, Tesso Nilo NP, Bukit Tigapuluh NP and *BKSDA*), *Dishut*, Police, local NGOs, WWF, FFI, *HarimauKita* and private sector (*Sinarmas Forestry* and PT. Riau Andalan Pulp and Paper/APRIL).

Four national level consultation meetings were then held. First, a meeting on 4-5 September 2014 assessed the

landscape information collected during the site visits, with special attention given to the METT scores, Capacity Development Scorecards and other issues arising through the public discussions. There were 17 participants from the MoEF (which chaired the meeting), *HarimauKita*, WCS, ZSL and FFI. Second, a meeting on 9-10 September 2014 reviewed in detail the draft Strategic Results Framework and draft project activity plan, as well as discussing implementation arrangements and the Financial Sustainability Scorecard. There were 21 participants from the MoEF (which chaired the meeting), *HarimauKita*, WCS, ZSL and FFI. Third, on 21 October 2014 a meeting was held at the UNDP CO to discuss and agree upon the project implementation arrangements. The meeting was attended by 15 people MoEF, Ministry of Finance, BAPPENAS, FFI, WCS, ZSL, HK and UNDP. Fourth, on 30 October 2014, a meeting was held at the *PHKA* office to review and discuss the project budget. The meeting was attended by >20 participants and attended MoEF (which chaired the meeting), *HarimauKita*, WCS, ZSL, FFI and UNDP. Finally, a Project Document review meeting was held in Bogor from 13-14 November 2014, with >40 representatives from MoEF (*PHKA-KKH*, the 5 target *UPTs*, *Planologi* and *PPH*), Ministry of Finance, FFI, WCS, ZSL, HK and UNDP.

Approach to stakeholder participation

The project will focus stakeholder engagement at the following levels of intervention: (i) working with national, provincial and local public institutions and agencies (especially national park authorities, *BKSDA* and Police) in order to strengthen their capacity to consolidate, expand and effectively manage the protected area system and to align project activities with the government's strategic priorities, especially the MoEF's NTRP; (ii) engaging with sub-national government agencies, when needed, who are responsible for land use and development planning for the landscapes and wider regions encompassing the target PAs (mainly *Bappeda* and Public works); and (iii) working directly with national park staff, civil society organisations, formal and informal resource users (rights holders), private landowners (mainly concessionaires) and individuals to strengthen collaborative relationships for participatory protected area management across the target landscapes, mitigate impacts of agribusiness practices, and ensure the socio-economic benefits arising from the project.

The ESSP report (see Project Document **Annex 5**) identified women and community groups as potential vulnerable stakeholder groups, whose participation might not be ensured in the project. In response, special consideration has been given to these groups through conducting a gender analysis and developing a community stakeholder involvement plan.

Gender analysis

The project design has followed the UNDP's Eight Point Agenda for Women Empowerment and Gender Equality:

1. Strengthen women's security in crisis: Stop violence against women
2. Advance gender justice: Provide justice and security for women
3. Expand Women's Citizenship, Participation and Leadership: Advance women as decision-makers
4. Build Peace with and for women: Involve women in all peace processes
5. Promote gender equality in disaster risk reduction: Value women's knowledge and experience
6. Ensure gender-responsive recovery: Support men and women to build back better
7. Transform government to deliver for women: Include women's issues in the national agenda
8. Develop Capacities for Social Change: Work together to transform society

For the project, most government agencies and public initiatives are still dominated by men in the five target landscapes, although women play an important role in household economic activities, not least in agricultural production that may be in national park buffer zones. During project implementation, a concerted effort will be made to take into account the special needs of women and to ensure their broad participation in project activities. This will be achieved through the following actions.

To ensure that gender is a prominent issue in the project, guidelines for the engagement of women in forest conservation will be developed based on analysis of: a) the roles women play in forest use and its management; b) the level of participation of women in project activities to date, factors which influence their participation and strategies which have increased their participation; and, c) the potential for women to be positively engaged. These guidelines will aim to increase the participation of women and to enhance the quality of their involvement in the project.

For two of the three partnering NGOs (ZSL and WCS), the most senior in-country position is filled by a woman and in *HarimauKita* women have long played play active roles as members, which suggests that gender discrimination is not a major issue. Nevertheless, special attention will be given to recruiting competent women to fill staff positions in the project team and also for consulting assignments.

Project staff who will be responsible for community engagement and facilitation will be trained to ensure that gender issues are addressed and that women are involved in group discussions and in group decision-making. During the PPG, a concerted effort was made to ensure that women participated in the stakeholder consultations and discussions. This approach will be carried over into project implementation to ensure that women are involved in group discussion activities, given opportunities to voice their opinions and to be proactively encouraged to do so.

Finally, to enable the Project to keep track of who is participating in its activities and who is receiving benefits from it, a monitoring and evaluation system will be constructed and implemented that includes, as one of the indicators, recording gender information. Ongoing reviews will enable the Project to keep track of gender sensitivity throughout implementation and make remedial changes, if necessary.

Breakdown of stakeholders

A full list of stakeholders, their relevant roles and responsibilities for each of the five target landscapes has been developed (see landscape profiles in Project Document **Annex 1**), from which a summary of the Project’s key stakeholders has been prepared as follows (Project Document **Table 15**).

Table 15. Preliminary list of key stakeholders of the project for government, private sector, NGOs and communities.

Stakeholder	Proposed role in the project	Potential conflict and mitigation
<i>National level</i>		
Ministry of Environment and Forestry	UNDP’s main government counterpart in Indonesia as national Implementing Partner (Executing Agency) for this project. Primary implementer of the project at national level (including head of PSC and PMU) and at landscape level through its subsidiary agencies (NP and <i>BKSDA</i>). Major beneficiary of capacity building (NP and <i>BKSDA</i>) and technical support for implementing core tasks in its NTRP and meeting international tiger (Global Tiger Initiative) and biodiversity commitments (CBD).	As the national Implementing Partner, there should be no potential conflict.
Ministry of National Development Planning (<i>BAPPENAS</i>)	Participant and beneficiary of planning and financing component (especially for wider landscapes outside protected areas) Will provide national government oversight, including monitoring and evaluation of the use of foreign funds. Will sit on PSC.	Seeks to support economic development that may not always be aligned with project forest management goals. Mitigation: close coordination with MoEF should ensure good coordination/alignment.
Police	Provincial police forces will be engaged as partners within landscape level networks for improved cooperation and coordination in tackling illegal wildlife and forest trade. National police will be regularly informed on project activities and progress, to feed into INTERPOL and ASEAN-WEN objectives related to illegal wildlife trade.	May not want to allocate time and/or resources towards project Mitigation: constructively engage police from outset (through PSC, capacity building and landscape partnerships).
Public Works	Capacity building related to implementation of the project plan, engagement with SMART Green Infrastructure guidelines.	Seeks to support infrastructure development that may not always be aligned with project forest management goals. Mitigation: close coordination with MoEF should ensure good coordination/alignment.
REDD+ Taskforce	The Task Force has a key role in ensuring a synergetic impact between planned REDD+ work and the envisaged project	No potential conflicts envisioned, but the PSC should ensure good

	interventions in and around landscapes that include REDD+ pilot provinces. Here, the mandated role would include coordination, synchronisation, planning, facilitation, management, monitoring, supervision and control of the pilot REDD+ activities.	communication and coordination with the Taskforce and therefore implementation in the field.
<i>Landscape level</i>		
Provincial and District Governments	Important stakeholders for project activities related to land use plan development and implementation, especially outside NPs in buffer zone forests, thus reducing external pressures on protected areas.	May show weak support for project as conserving natural resources may be seen to restrict economic development. Mitigation: project will engage with local government members and raise awareness of the benefits of conservation/ecosystem services through demonstration activities
National Park Agencies	These agencies and their subsidiary units will be the primary implementers of the demonstration activities at provincial and district levels, including through RBM units. Major beneficiaries of capacity building and technical assistance to strengthen NP management effectiveness. NP agencies for the 5 target sites will sit on the PSC.	As the principal implementing partners at the landscape level and being under MoEF, there should be no potential conflict.
Natural Resources Conservation Agencies (BKSDA)	This agency will be a key partner for activities outside NPs, including problem wildlife management and tackling illegal wildlife trade. Beneficiary of capacity-building support and strengthened partnership with other relevant agencies to help advance effectiveness of its own work. BKSDA for Kampar landscape will sit on the PSC.	As the principal implementing partners at the landscape level and being under MoEF, there should be no potential conflict.
Provincial/District Forestry Agencies (<i>Dishut</i>)	Key stakeholders for the provincial level activities, including capacity building and improved wildlife and forest management outside of national parks, especially in critically important buffer zones.	May not support adaptations to current forest and wildlife management methods. Mitigation: project executants will include senior forestry department staff in each focal area.
Provincial agencies for Watershed Management (<i>BPDAS</i>)	Stakeholders in provincial and district level project activities related to forest ecosystem services outside NPs.	As key implementing partners at the landscape level and being under MoEF, there should be no potential conflict.
Provincial development and planning agencies (<i>Bappeda</i>)	Primary stakeholders for provincial level activities outside of NPs. Stakeholders for land use plan and financing plan development and implementation.	Seek to support subnational economic development that may not always be aligned with project forest management goals. Mitigation: close coordination with PMU and Landscape Teams should ensure good coordination/alignment.
Provincial/District Tourism and Culture Agency (<i>DisBudPar</i>)	Stakeholders in provincial and district level project activities related to nature tourism. Nature tourism, especially inside NPs is not well developed in Sumatra and within the project few opportunities exist to support this.	No conflict perceived, unless tourism lodges were to be built inside NPs, but there are no plans for this.
Local communities and indigenous people	Important participants of the project at the local level and targets of efforts to change unsustainable activities including poaching and encroachment. May include those from transmigrant sites (e.g. Sembilang). Key role in project as forest rangers and members of local informant network, as well as beneficiaries of alternative livelihood strategies, such as Village Forest and REDD+. In Kampar, NGOs may play an ongoing watchdog role over forest management practices of private sector concessionaires.	Some communities may not agree with the project, be fearful over loss of user rights to land and natural resources. Mitigation: Identify key issues through the UNDP's ESSP and ensure full consultation and involvement during the inception phase.

CBOs	CBOs will be primary stakeholders involved in landscape interventions, mainly in problem wildlife management and tackling wildlife trade, and in cases receiving project support through technical trainings.	Will be strongly supported through the project; however, some activities or mechanisms may need adapting which could raise objections. Mitigation: full consultation from early stage of the project.
<i>HarimauKita</i>	<i>HarimauKita</i> will work with the MoEF in playing a facilitating role between landscape partners and with national PMU. It will act as a technical partner to the MoEF in the Global Tiger Initiative by attending regional meetings and supporting document preparation.	Government agencies may be unwilling to work with <i>HarimauKita</i> due to issues of confidentiality of information or differences in institutional culture, but given the long-term and successful partnership, there should be no potential conflict.
International NGOs (FFI, WCS, ZSL and WWF-Indonesia)	FFI, WCS and ZSL will provide technical expertise on capacity building, operational and other inputs to the project at landscape and national levels. WWF-Indonesia (RIMBA Project) to be regularly informed concerning project development and implementation; its role will be explored during the inception phase.	Government agencies may be unwilling to work with NGOs due to issues of confidentiality of information or differences in institutional culture, but given the existing background of long-term and successful landscape-level partnerships, such potential conflict is unlikely.
Academic institutions	Conducting management oriented scientific research and surveys, as well as recipients of capacity building support. Supporting science-based monitoring of focal species population trends is a key component of evaluating project intervention strategy. Universities may be from national (such as <i>UNAS</i> , <i>UI</i> and <i>IPB</i>) and provincial (such as <i>UNAND</i> and <i>USU</i>) institutions.	Universities programmes may not be geared towards the needs of the relevant implementing agencies. Mitigation: suitable and willing universities will be identified and engaged at the start of the project to allow greater communication and participation throughout.
Private agribusiness sector - pulp/paper (e.g. APRIL, SinarMas) and oil palm (e.g. PT Whana Sumponjen Indah, Raja Palma)	Targets of efforts to reduce environmentally destructive and unsustainable activities. Demonstration sites for enabling private sector involvement in biodiversity-friendly investments and rural livelihood creation through sustainable financing schemes that follow best practices standards such as CCB. Will have key roles in Kampar, and in securing buffer areas around Berbak NP and Sembilang NP.	May be unwilling to change practices or resolve land tenure conflicts with state owned forest land to suit project objectives. Mitigation: The main plantation companies in this landscape have adopted sustainable forest management policies, so good coordination with project landscape teams should ensure a complementary approach.
Private logging sector (e.g. PT Putra Duta Indawood, PT Persona Belantara Persada)	Targets of efforts to reduce environmentally destructive and unsustainable activities. Demonstration site/s for enabling private sector involvement in environmentally-friendly certification initiatives.	May be unwilling to change practices to suit project objectives. Mitigation: Encourage and support forest management policy development, including adoption of environmentally-friendly timber certification scheme.

Stakeholder engagement plan for each project component and output

The final agreement through which stakeholders (beyond the project partners) will be involved at the national and landscape levels will be decided during the inception phase when a full Stakeholder Implementation Plan will be developed. Here, a *preliminary Stakeholder Implementation Plan* is presented. The project proposes a mechanism to achieve broad-based stakeholder involvement in the project preparation and implementation processes. Stakeholder participation will include the following components:

- Project Steering Committee - Chair: Director General of *PHKA*; Members: MoEF, *BAPPENAS*, UNDP (for project assurance), BKSDA Riau and the UPTs for the five National Parks, CSO representative(s).
- Project Management Unit - Includes MoEF/*PHKA* (Head), Key partner assistance (such as national government, local government, NGOs and private sector) will be invited as appropriate.
- Technical Advisory Committee - Chaired by the NPD with support from the NPM. Aims to provide technical advice and inputs relating to project implementation. Members will consist of representatives from MoEF, UNDP, other relevant government agencies, research and educational organizations, NGOs (including FFI, WCS, ZSL and *HarimauKita*), technical experts and other relevant stakeholders to be agreed by the PSC. Technical experts may be invited in to discuss specific issues.
- Project Implementation Teams - Representatives from National Park authority and NGO partners; Technical experts may be invited in to discuss specific issues.

Long-term stakeholder participation

The project will provide the following opportunities for the long-term participation of all stakeholders. Emphasis will be placed on the active participation of local communities, where appropriate, and enhancement of inter-sectoral and sub-national transboundary coordination for achieving effective protected area management across multiple landscapes.

Decision-making: The establishment of the Project Steering Committee will empower national level stakeholders, especially the MoEF. The structure will follow a participatory and transparent process involving the confirmation of all key project stakeholders; conducting one-to-one consultations with all stakeholders; development of Terms of Reference and norms; inception meeting to agree on the constitution of the Project Steering Committee.

Capacity building: This is an important project intervention that will target all stakeholders, and at various levels (national, landscape and individual), who have the potential to be involved in implementing natural resource management activities in and around the protected areas, or whose own activities, such as infrastructure development, are likely to influence the success of these activities. Women, ethnic minority, and other community groups will be proactively considered for capacity building activities based on specific needs assessments that, in turn, increases their meaningful participation.

Communication: will include the participatory development of an integrated communication strategy. The communication strategy will be based on the following key principles:

- providing information to all stakeholders
- promoting dialogue between all stakeholders
- promoting access to information.

The project's design incorporates several features to ensure on-going and effective stakeholder participation in the project's implementation. The mechanisms to facilitate involvement and active participation of different stakeholder in project implementation will comprise a number of different components, as follows.

i) Project inception workshop

The project will be launched by a multi-stakeholder workshop. This workshop will provide an opportunity to provide all stakeholders with the most updated information on the project, refine and confirm the work plan, and will establish a basis for further consultation as the project's implementation commences.

ii) Constitution of the Project Steering Committee

The PSC will be constituted to ensure consistent representation of the key stakeholders throughout the

project's implementation. The representation, and broad terms of reference, of the Committee are described in the Project Document **Management Arrangements in Section I Part III**.

iii) Constitution of the Technical Advisory Committee

The TAC will be constituted to provide consistent representation of wider stakeholders beyond the PSC with an interest or influence over project activities and outcomes. It will provide a means of updating stakeholders at the national level about project implementation progress, to share lessons learned, obtain information about and coordinate with related initiatives, and to obtain technical advice on specific issues. A subset of TAC members may be tasked to undertake specific project-related assignments. See Project Document **Management Arrangements in Section I Part III**.

iv) Establishment of the Project Management Unit

PHKA will take direct operational responsibility for facilitating stakeholder involvement and ensuring increased local ownership of the project and its results. The Unit will be located in the *PHKA* office in Jakarta and will be supported sub-nationally through landscape teams in Kerinci, Bukit Barisan Selatan, Gunung Leuser and Berbak-Sembilang (Kampar will not need a permanent team because it is a different type of project demonstration site). This should ensure coordination among key stakeholder organizations at the landscape and local levels during the project.

v) Establishment of Project Implementation Units

At the activity level, a Project Implementation Unit will be established for each landscape to facilitate the active participation of key institutions, organisations and individuals in the implementation of the respective project activities. Different stakeholder groups may take the lead in specially formed working groups, depending on their respective mandates and the local design. There will be equitable representation of women and ethnic minorities on site stakeholder committees and groups related to livelihoods and awareness activities.

vi) Project communications

The project will develop, implement and annually update a communications strategy to ensure that all stakeholders are informed on an on-going basis about: the project's objectives; the project's activities; overall project progress; and the opportunities for stakeholders' involvement in various aspects of the project's implementation.

vii) Implementation arrangements for stakeholder participation in project activities

A number of project activities have specifically been designed to directly involve local stakeholders in the implementation of, and benefit from, these activities. These include: the creation or development of new opportunities for sustainable livelihood options and natural resource uses for local communities. Women and minority groups will be proactively considered for participation in sustainable livelihood activities based on these assessments. The principle of FPIC will be applied to the establishment of any conservation management agreements established with local communities, in line with the project's approach to environmental and social risk management as identified through the ESSP (see Project Document **Annex 5**).

viii) Formalizing cooperative governance structures

The project will actively seek to formalize cooperative governance structures, codified within partner MoUs, at the landscape level to ensure on-going participation of local stakeholders in the planning and management of the five target national parks and their surrounding forest.

ix) Capacity building

All project activities are strategically focused on building capacity – at systemic, institutional and individual levels – of the key stakeholder groups to ensure sustainability of initial project investments. The project will also seek to raise public awareness of the value and importance of the ecosystem services and biodiversity secured through effective habitat conservation and restoration.

Coordination with related initiatives

The UNDP will ensure close collaboration and synergetic impact with a number of UNDP-led initiatives in the country, especially those offering opportunities to co-finance community livelihood development, climate change adaptation and poverty alleviation. The project will be fully integrated in the UNDP’s Country Programme and have close ties with the UN’s Environment Programme (UNEP) and its relevant in-country projects. The project will work closely with UN-REDD Programme and its partners in strengthening the links between the national PA network, sustainable landscape management and REDD+ community-based activities, and will also explore increasing sustainable financing opportunities through the REDD+ mechanism. Linkages and synergies will be sought through coordination with the GEF projects listed in **Table 16** below.

Table 16. Coordination and collaboration with related GEF financed initiatives

Project	How collaboration with the project will be ensured
UNDP/GEF, E-PASS (CEO Endorsed)	<p>E-PASS intends to focus on institutional planning and management capacity within protected areas, financial sustainability of protected areas and threat reduction and co-management at the protected area borders. It therefore shares several common goals with the Sumatra project and is highly complementary. There is no significant overlap as E-PASS focuses on the island of Sulawesi.</p> <p>The MoEF/PHKA is the executing agency for this project. It will also head the Project Steering Committee, which quite likely would be based out of the same office as the Sumatra Project Steering Committee. All of these characteristics provide a mechanism for information sharing, lesson learning, coordination and frequent communication. Further, plenty of opportunities exist for collaboration and sharing approaches and experiences, e.g. in SMART-patrolling and REDD pilot projects, that can maximize project impacts. Cross-representation on the respective Project Steering Committees for the two projects would further increase opportunities for coordination and, during the inception phase, activities of mutual interest actively explored so that synergies can be developed for the implementation phase.</p>
UNEP/GEF, RIMBA (Council Approved)	<p>WWF in partnership with UNEP is developing the RIMBA project, which intends to work with national, provincial and district government partners in the production landscapes of a portion (3 provinces) of the central Sumatra landscape. Whereas the Sumatra-wide project proposed here predominantly focuses on the island’s main protected areas, which are the highest priority for biodiversity conservation, the RIMBA project focuses on strengthening connections between forested areas across a corridor of mainly production landscapes, from Kerinci Seblat NP in the west to Berbak NP in the east, where components of biodiversity, especially large-bodied mammals, would disperse from the protected areas. The RIMBA project takes a complementary approach through its strong emphasis on developing a green economy including investing in natural capital and low carbon growth initiatives outside of protected areas.</p> <p>The MoEF/PHKA is a technical executing partner for the RIMBA project. It will therefore ensure coordination of complementary project activities and sharing of project documents and other information. This, PHKA as the head of the Sumatra Project Steering Committee will have the authority to invite RIMBA representatives to participate in meetings of thematic relevance, thereby identifying synergies and areas for collaboration, especially in production forests protecting critical habitat, corridors and breeding grounds for wildlife in protected area buffer zones.</p>

UN-REDD, National REDD+ Strategy	<p>The Indonesia REDD+ Programme receives funding from various agencies, including UN-REDD, the World Bank’s Forest Carbon Partnership Facility and the Government of Norway. The Government of Indonesia through its REDD Task Force is currently focusing on REDD preparation. This includes the strengthening of institutions required to implement an effective REDD programme and the technology required to monitor and measure reduced emissions.</p> <p>The MoEF is integral to the development of this REDD+ programme and five Sumatran provinces are currently receiving support from the national government’s REDD readiness phase. Thus, the Project Steering Committee will coordinate its activities at the national level with the REDD Task Force, whereas the project Landscape Teams (overseen by the Project Management Unit) will work cooperatively with the provincial level pilot teams, under <i>Bappeda</i>, that are mandated to established REDD+ Body (<i>Badan REDD+ Provinsi</i>). Here, the project can provide information on civil society involvement in reducing deforestation, e.g. working with the law enforcement agencies.</p>
UNESCO-WHS, Rapid Response Facility (RRF)	<p>The RRF was designed to provide timely resources to address threats and emergencies affecting World Heritage Sites (WHS) and surrounding areas of influence, and to do so quickly, flexibly and in real time. Two grants have been made that are relevant to the project, one that was recently awarded to address a spike in elephant poaching in the Gunung Leuser landscape and another that is a pipeline grant for increasing the law enforcement response in the Kerinci Seblat landscape.</p> <p>The nature of RRF grants are to operate in a short time frame (months and not years) to mitigate emerging threats. The project is working in three UNESCO WHSs and the RRF grants will no doubt be highly relevant. The project will therefore ensure that it is ready to collaborate and coordinate activities with any RRF awardee during implementation.</p>
UNDP/GEF National Biodiversity Planning to Support the Implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan (CEO Approved)	<p>This project aims to strengthen National biodiversity framework for implementation of Indonesia Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (IBSAP) and integration Indonesia’s obligations under CBD into its national development and sectoral planning frameworks in line with the CBD’s Strategic Plan for 2011-2020. Lead executing agencies are: Ministry of Environment, BAPPENAS (National Development and Planning Agency), Indonesia Institute of Sciences (LIPI).</p> <p>Coordination with this project will be achieved through the Project Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee, in order to exchange information and take note of developments on both sides. This should ensure integration of NTRP priorities into the IBSAP, as well as ensuring that relevant IBSAP priority actions are taken into account during project implementation and reporting.</p>
IFAD/GEF Sustainable Management of Peatland Ecosystems in Indonesia (2014-2018) (PIF Approved)	<p>This project aims to conserve and significantly reduce GHG emissions from peatlands through sustainably managing peatlands and meeting the livelihood needs of adjacent communities. It follows up on the recently completed IFAD/GEF project rehabilitation and sustainable management of peatlands in SE Asia (APFP). Both projects aim to assist the Indonesian government to implement the ASEAN Peatland Management Strategy (2006 - 2020), the National Strategy for Sustainable Peatland Management (revised 2012), and the recently ratified (2014) ASEAN Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution. The Ministry of Environment is the national executing agency.</p> <p>Specific activities in Sumatra include the minimization of peatland fires through Fire/Haze Free Villages Program in targeted districts in northern Riau province, and partnership for sustainable management of peatlands in Indragiri Hilir District of Riau province. National aspects are also of relevance, including hydrological mapping of peatland units, best management practices for peatlands, and fire prediction and warning systems.</p> <p>Coordination with this project will be accomplished through the Project Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee.</p>

The Project will coordinate with the GTI⁶, through directly contributing to the National Tiger Action Plan. The project will promote the objectives and recommendations of the NTRP and will work in Indonesia’s designated Tiger Conservation Landscapes (TCLs). The project will coordinate with other initiatives through *PHKA* and programmes being implemented by the local and international NGOs. Relevant work includes the following.

⁶ <http://globaltigerinitiative.org/>

For Indonesia, the Forest Investment Programme (supported by the Asian Development Bank, World Bank and International Finance Corporation) has assigned a grant of US\$37.5 million and a loan of US\$32.5 million, of which the potential Sumatra provinces for interventions are Aceh, Jambi, Riau and South Sumatra. The development objective of the Investment Plan is to reduce barriers to sub-national REDD+ implementation and to increase provincial and local capacity for REDD+ and sustainable forest management. Key entry points for the Investment Plan to address sub-national barriers will be the national Forest Management Unit (*Kesatuan Pengelolaan Hutan*) system and ongoing tenure reform processes. Activities will focus on the following three inter-related themes: Institutional development for sustainable forest and natural resource management; Investments in forest enterprises and community based forest management; and, Community capacity building and livelihoods development. As the MoEF will be the chief executing agency, the project will coordinate its efforts through *PHKA* to ensure complementarity.

A tiger conservation programme managed by IUCN, International Union for Conservation of Nature, is being supported by €20 million from the German government through the KfW Development Bank. The aim of the programme is to increase the number of tigers in the wild and improve the livelihoods of communities living in and close to their habitat. The five-year Integrated Tiger Habitat Conservation Programme will benefit NGOs and conservation authorities from selected tiger range countries which committed to doubling the number of tigers occurring within their territories by 2020. Eligible countries include Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Laos, Myanmar, Nepal and Viet Nam.

The TFCA is a debt for nature swap scheme between the US and Indonesian Governments, based on the 1998 US Law on Tropical Forest Conservation. The scheme acts as a mechanism to reduce foreign debts of the countries with high tropical forest riches, to the US Government. TFCA Sumatera or The Action of Sumatera Tropical Forest Conservation manages some funds derived from the swap of Indonesian Government debts to the US Government (debt for nature swap) amounting to US\$29.6 million lasting for up to 10 years. In this bilateral agreement, two NGOs act as swap partners (Conservation International and *KEHATI*), with each contributing US\$1 million. The program is managed by the Oversight Committee with four permanent members consisting of the Indonesian Government represented by the MoEF, the US Government represented by the USAID and the representatives from the two NGOs.

The German Development Bank KfW, on behalf of the German Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), has signed an agreement with the Indonesian government for a €23 million project, to be implemented by the MoEF's BPDAS and PHKA, in and around in Kerinci Seblat National Park, including sub-watersheds in the districts Merangin and Kerinci. Support will be provided for enforcement activities, biodiversity conservation and rehabilitation of critical watersheds, as well as 20 buffer zone development projects that promote community forestry schemes. The project, through FFI, has been in dialogue with the preparation team since 2012. Next, KfW and the MoEF are preparing a €8.5 million project to support the Leuser Ecosystem in Aceh, with a special focus on the districts of Aceh Selatan, Subulussalam and Singkil. Support will be provided to selected communities in conservation-oriented development activities and in resolving conflicts with the Gunung Leuser Ecosystem or adjacent forests, as well as strengthening the capacity of conservation related institutions (GLNP, *BKSDA* and district authorities).

The MCC/MCAI GP Project. Berbak has been selected for potential investment from the MCC/MCAI GP Project in the districts of Muaro Jambi and Tanjung Jabung Timur, with MoUs between MCAI and the district heads signed. The project's main focus is improving local rural livelihoods through low carbon development, based on an understanding that protection and conservation of the TAHURA and Berbak NP are essential for achieving this goal. The key project areas include renewable energy, improving land use practices and natural resource management and spatial planning.

Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) - supports a project focused on restoring mangrove ecosystems degraded by the construction of fish ponds in the Sembilang National Park area. Activities include field studies on

the causes and location of mangrove destruction, biophysical and social-economic condition of the area, construction of tree nurseries and site restoration through assisted natural regeneration, enrichment planting, and planting.

The newly-launched GIZ project entitled Biodiversity and Climate (BIOCLIME) aims to support biodiversity conservation and to maintain carbon storage capacity from HCV forest ecosystems in South Sumatra, thereby supporting sustainable development and low carbon emissions. Thus, there is an opportunity for Sembilang NP through better-managed development around its borders, securing all remaining HCV forests in the vicinity that extends wildlife habitat and secures the national park's buffer zone.

FFI, WCS and ZSL run similar types of projects in core sites in respective focal NPs, which include SMART-based patrolling, human-tiger conflict mitigation, tiger population monitoring through camera trapping. Funding from these projects will be used as co-financing.

WWF: Besides the RIMBA project, there are also general complementary programme interests with this project, including capacity building for SMART-based patrolling in Riau and Jambi protected areas, capacity development for PA management and sustainable land use, development of indicators for PA management minimum standards, support for data gathering for spatial planning including ecosystem services. WWF also collaborates with the Rhino Foundation of Indonesia (*Yayasan Badak Indonesia, YABI*) in a Sumatran rhino population monitoring and protection project that collaborates with the national park authorities in Bukit Barisan Selatan and Gunung Leuser.

RER: the pulp and paper company APRIL has set up *RER* to manage Ecosystem Restoration Concession projects in the Kampar Peninsula. Its projects aim to restore degraded peat swamp forest over 60 years through a comprehensive work plan that has been developed in line with the CCB Standards. APRIL has allocated US\$17 million. FFI is working as the principal technical partner of RER and APRIL for this project and therefore enables direct engagement for the Sumatra GEF project.

ASEAN Wildlife Enforcement Network: Project partners include the two key Government of Indonesia representatives to this regional wildlife trade reduction forum (Department of Forestry and National Police).

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF):

National and Local Socio-economic Benefits

At the local level, tangible socioeconomic benefits will be delivered to rural communities directly, through better managing their conflicts with wildlife and indirectly the protection and restoration of the major watershed forests in Sumatra and the ecosystem services that they provide. The province of Aceh in northern Sumatra provides compelling evidence of the importance of these services, which are found in all other project provinces. A total economic valuation of well-protected forest and its ecosystem services in Aceh, for example, estimated these to be worth US\$12.9 billion over 30 years. Although this represents local and national benefits, at least some of these local benefits would be expected to offset the costs of conserving globally significant biodiversity in the forests. No doubt the other large tropical forest landscapes covering multiple watersheds located along the Barisan mountain chain (i.e. Kerinci Seblat, Gunung Leuser and Bukit Barisan Selatan) or deep peat (i.e. Berbak-Sembilang and Kampar) offer significant, yet unquantified, benefits towards the climate, communities and biodiversity at subnational, national and international levels.

At the national level, this project will represent a model for how forest resources should be managed and thus will have a direct impact on the estimated 100 million people who are estimated to depend on forest resources, in particular the 50 million who are living on land classified as public forest. Furthermore, the project will directly support the Government of Indonesia in implementing its national REDD+ scheme in pilot Sumatran sites, e.g.

Berbak, through delivering improved management of forests and biodiversity that clearly demonstrates reduced rates of deforestation and loss of globally significant biodiversity. Local communities represent an important stakeholder in REDD+ projects and will be entitled to a share of revenue.

There are two project components where gender has been identified as being important. In Component 1, the role of women in protected area management may be influential on success. Indonesia has a relatively good record at empowering women compared to some countries, but significant barriers to progress still remain. The importance of gender equality will therefore be addressed specifically when management structure and reforms are addressed. Gender will also be important in Component 2 when engaging communities through green rural development and income generating schemes for rural households, firstly because women may have a different relationship with their environment to men, which might reflect the range of development and conservation options they would find beneficial and secondly because female engagement in implementation is likely to be important for the success of development projects.

Overall, the project will seek to establish or strengthen stakeholder participation mechanisms in order to achieve legally recognized, sustainable management of natural resources in buffer zones and to mitigate resource use conflicts as appropriate. Accordingly, the project aims to introduce a participatory approach to PA management that will involve awareness raising, environmental education, involvement in management activities, stakeholder representation in site committees, and support for sustainable livelihood activities in suitable locations. The project aims to engender support for PA management from local communities and other stakeholders (eg private sector), for which an inclusive and mutually beneficial approach is needed. In order to avoid negative impacts on local communities, the project will also ensure that stakeholders will be involved in the development of conservation agreements and other local area management plan development, and capacity will be developed within both genders for their implementation, thereby increasing women's and men's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources and capital assets. For sites implementing REDD+, Village Forest or Ecosystem Restoration Concession activities (Kerinci Seblat, Berbak-Sembilang and the Kampar landscapes) an FPIC process will be used to ensure meaningful community involvement in these project activities.

The project's **global environmental benefits** derive from improved management effectiveness and sustainable financing of five globally important National Parks (WHC and Ramsar Sites) totaling 3,185,358 ha that form the core of key tiger conservation landscapes totaling 8,182,192 ha (see summary information on these sites in Project Document **Table 7** and landscape profiles in Project Document **Annex 1**). The project will strengthen partnerships at landscape level to reduce key threats to wildlife, including poaching, wildlife trade, human-wildlife conflicts and habitat destruction. The overall success of the project will be indicated by an increase in Sumatran tiger density in core areas in the target landscapes. The capacity building and improved PA management systems will strengthen the entire national PA system through uptake by the MoEF. Thus, the global environmental benefits that the project is expected to bring include the delivery on all major national strategies for biodiversity conservation in Sumatra, leading to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and the generation of improved financing mechanisms for the protection of biodiversity inside and new mechanisms for outside protected areas. Overall, these outcomes will provide improved protection for globally significant populations of key species, including Sumatran tiger, Asian elephant, Sumatran orangutan, Sumatran rhinoceros, globally important ecoregions and some of the most highly diverse plant communities in the world.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The project takes the approach of addressing barriers to the achievement of effective biodiversity conservation in five large protected area landscapes in Sumatra, including weak natural resource governance and protected area management capacity, poor inter-agency coordination, and inadequate financial planning and management for protected areas. This approach is cost-effective in that it will have broad applicability at provincial and national levels, including impacts beyond the target protected area landscapes. As such, the project contributes directly towards larger national policy, regulatory, fiscal, data management and communications goals in support of biodiversity conservation and an effectively managed national PA system. The project implementation arrangements include links between the target PA landscape and national levels (e.g. in relation to sustainable financing for PAs, and implementation of the NTRP) to ensure that this potential will be realized.

The project strategy also focuses on taking existing best practice experiences delivered by the partner CSOs in specific landscapes and transferring and piloting these in other landscapes in order to extend their impact and raise overall standards through capacity building and systematization, which is highly cost-effective and low risk. The project's second component aims to build support for biodiversity conservation in the target landscapes through building partnerships across multiple sectors (involving government, CSOs, private sector and other stakeholders) for more effective implementation of NTRP actions in particular. This approach also seeks to replicate and test partnership approaches that have been successful in other landscapes for cost-efficiency and maximum project impact.

At a technical level, the streamlining of progressive approaches into the targeted National Parks for upscaling throughout Indonesia's PA system for law enforcement, monitoring and information management will be a cost-effective investment in terms of project impact as well as MoEF's operations in the long term. This includes technical support and capacity building (e.g. in application of SMART patrolling) for the implementation of MoEF's RBM approach at the targeted National Parks, which should result in more cost-effective PA enforcement.

The project's financial sustainability component will demonstrate and share new sustainable financing mechanisms to meet long-term management needs for the targeted PAs with potential to replicate successful models elsewhere in Indonesia. It will review and recommend how available resources can be used most efficiently through conducting a financial sustainability analysis and related financial planning to improve cost-effectiveness and disbursement mechanisms for the targeted PAs. The sustainable financing of the targeted PAs will be strengthened through identifying other potential revenue streams and developing sustainable financing mechanisms. Sustainable financing of the national PA system will be supported through developing and operationalizing an institutional framework and review and recommendations for national regulatory and policy improvements. Finally, public-private partnerships will be developed to support biodiversity-friendly land uses and reduce key threats to wildlife within the priority landscapes, with sustainable financing plans developed and implemented for selected production areas through business and biodiversity mechanisms (PES schemes) private sector endowment and corporate social responsibility schemes and biodiversity offsetting). Collectively, these approaches will secure and extend long term financing for the target PAs and biodiversity conservation in wider landscapes beyond existing levels.

The total GEF investment of US\$9,000,000 for this project will leverage a minimum of US\$53.45 million in cofinancing, a highly cost-effective ratio of 5.95 with additional associated financing inputs anticipated during project implementation. The overall GEF investment in strengthening management effectiveness for the targeted National Parks in Sumatra (3,185,358 ha) will average around US\$ 0.56 per hectare per year, a small fraction of the estimated value of the ecosystem services provided.

Finally, the recognition associated with involvement in an international project and receipt of GEF resources channeled through a UN implementing agency is a source of pride for national, regional and local project partners in Indonesia, which can provide a much strengthened position in addressing critical threats to protected areas such as road development, mining and hydro-electric schemes. The increased awareness, capacity and improved communications between different layers of government that the project will also enable will facilitate the political commitment to take difficult decisions on issues such as expanding the PA network, upgrading PA protection status, inter-agency coordination to reduce external pressures on PAs, and the adoption of more environmentally friendly practices in related sectors. These all represent significant cost-effective project impacts.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

MONITORING AND REPORTING⁷

Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures and will be provided by the project team and the UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) with support from the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit in Bangkok. The Strategic Results Framework in **Section II Part I** provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The M&E plan includes: inception report, project implementation reviews, quarterly and annual review reports, and mid-term review and final evaluation. The following sections outline the principal components of the M&E Plan and indicative cost estimates related to M&E activities (see **Table 13** below). The project's M&E Plan will be presented and finalized in the Project's Inception Report following a collective fine-tuning of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities.

1. A Project Inception Workshop will be conducted with the full project team, relevant government counterparts, co-financing partners, the UNDP-CO and representation from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit, as well as UNDP-GEF (HQs) as appropriate. A fundamental objective of the Inception Workshop will be to assist the project team to understand and take ownership of the project's goal and objective, as well as finalize preparation of the project's first Annual Work Plan (AWP) and annual and quarterly activity plans on the basis of the Strategic Results Framework. This will include reviewing the logframe (indicators, means of verification, assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise, finalizing the AWP with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project.

2. A detailed schedule of project review meetings will be developed by the project management, in consultation with project implementation partners and stakeholder representatives and incorporated in the Project Inception Report. Day-to-day monitoring of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the Project Manager based on the project's AWP, activity plans and its indicators. Specific targets for the first year implementation progress indicators together with their means of verification will be developed at the Inception Workshop and included in the AWP. Targets and indicators for subsequent years would be defined annually as part of the internal evaluation and planning processes undertaken by the project team.

3. Measurement of impact indicators related to biodiversity conservation targets (as presented in the Strategic Results Framework) will occur according to the schedules defined in the Inception Workshop. Periodic monitoring of implementation progress will be undertaken by the UNDP-CO through quarterly meetings with the Implementing Partner, or more frequently as deemed necessary. This will allow parties to take stock and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure smooth implementation of project activities.

4. Annual Monitoring will occur through the PSC Meetings (PSCMs). This is the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. The project will be subject to PSCMs at least two times a year. The first such meeting will be held within the first six months of the start of full implementation.

5. The Project Manager in consultations with UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU will prepare a UNDP/GEF Project Implementation Review (PIR) during the months of June-August. In addition, the Project Manager, in consultation with UNDP-CO will prepare an Annual Review Report (ARR) by the end of January and submit it to PSC members at least two weeks prior to the PSCM for review and comments. The ARR will be used as one of the basic documents for discussions in the PSCM. The Project Manager will present the ARR (and if needed the PIR) to the PSC, highlighting policy issues and recommendations for the decision of the PSCM participants. The Project

⁷ As per GEF guidelines, the project will also be using the BD 1 Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). New or additional GEF monitoring requirements will be accommodated and adhered to once they are officially launched.

Manager also informs the participants of any agreement reached by stakeholders during the PIR/ARR preparation on how to resolve operational issues. Separate reviews of each project component may also be conducted if necessary. The PSC has the authority to suspend disbursement if project performance benchmarks are not met. Benchmarks will be developed at the Inception Workshop, based on delivery rates, and qualitative assessments of achievements of outputs.

6. The terminal PSCM is held in the last month of project operations. The Project Manager is responsible for preparing the Terminal Report and submitting it to UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU. It shall be prepared in draft at least two months in advance of the terminal PSCM in order to allow review, and will serve as the basis for discussions in the PSCM. The terminal meeting considers the implementation of the project as a whole, paying particular attention to whether the project has achieved its stated objectives and contributed to the broader environmental objective. It decides whether any actions are still necessary, particularly in relation to sustainability of project results, and acts as a vehicle through which lessons learnt can be captured to feed into other projects.

7. UNDP Country Offices and UNDP-GEF RCU as appropriate, will conduct yearly visits to project sites based on an agreed upon schedule to be detailed in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Any other member of the Project Board can also accompany.

Project Reporting

8. The Project Manager will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports that form part of the monitoring process. A Project Inception Report will be prepared immediately following the Inception Workshop. It will include a detailed Annual Work Plan divided in quarterly time-frames detailing the activities and progress indicators that will guide implementation during the first year of the project. An Annual Review Report shall be prepared by the Project Manager and shared with the Project Steering Committee. As minimum requirement, the ARR shall consist of the Atlas standard format for the Project Progress Report (PPR) covering the whole year with updated information for each element of the PPR as well as a summary of results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the project level. The ARR should consist of the following sections: (i) project risks and issues; (ii) project progress against pre-defined indicators and targets and (iii) outcome performance. The Project Implementation Review is an annual monitoring process mandated by the GEF. Once the project has been under implementation for a year (from the CEO approval date), a Project Implementation Report must be completed by the CO together with the project team. Quarterly progress reports: Short reports outlining main updates in project progress will be provided quarterly to the local UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF RCU by the project team. UNDP ATLAS Monitoring Reports: A Combined Delivery Report (CDR) summarizing all project expenditures, is mandatory and should be issued quarterly following the finalization of the quarterly progress reports. The following logs should be prepared: (i) The Issues Log is used to capture and track the status of all project issues throughout the implementation of the project. (ii) the Risk Log is maintained throughout the project to capture potential risks to the project and associated measures to manage risks; and (iii) the Lessons Learned Log is maintained throughout the project to capture insights and lessons based on good and bad experiences and behaviours. Project Terminal Report: During the last three months of the project the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. Periodic Thematic Reports: As and when called for by UNDP, UNDP-GEF or the Implementing Partner, the project team will prepare Specific Thematic Reports, focusing on specific issues or areas of activity. Technical Reports are detailed documents covering specific areas of analysis or scientific specializations within the overall project. As part of the Inception Report, the project team will prepare a draft Reports List, detailing the technical reports that are expected to be prepared on key areas of activity during the course of the Project, and tentative due dates. Where necessary this Reports List will be revised and updated, and included in subsequent APRs.

External Evaluations

9. The project will be subjected to at least one independent external review and one evaluation: An independent Mid-Term Review will be undertaken at the mid-point of the project lifetime. The Mid-Term Review will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Furthermore, it will review and update the ESSP report. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term review will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The ToR for this Mid-term review will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit.

10. An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the terminal Project Board meeting, and will focus on the same issues as the mid-term review. The final evaluation will also look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. The Final Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities. The ToR for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit.

Learning and Knowledge Sharing

11. The project will develop a communications strategy in the first year, which will be updated annually and implementation supported by communications, education and/or awareness personnel from FFI, WCS and ZSL. This will include capturing and disseminating lessons learned, for review at PB meetings in order to inform the direction and management of the project, and shared with project stakeholders as appropriate. A project completion report will document the project's achievements and lessons learned at the end of the project. Results from the project will also be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through a number of existing information sharing networks and forums.

Branding and Visibility

12. Full compliance is required with UNDP's Branding Guidelines and guidance on the use of the UNDP logo. These can be accessed at <http://web.undp.org/comtoolkit/reaching-the-outside-world/outside-world-core-concepts-visual.shtml>. Full compliance is also required with the GEF Branding Guidelines and guidance on the use of the GEF logo. These can be accessed at http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo. The UNDP and GEF logos should be the same size. When both logs appear on a publication, the UNDP logo should be on the left top corner and the GEF logo on the right top corner. Further details are available from the UNDP-GEF team based in the region.

Audit Clause

Audits will be conducted according to UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable Audit policies.

Table 13. M&E Activities, Responsibilities, Budget and Time Frame

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop	Project Coordinator UNDP CO UNDP GEF	25,000	Within first two months of project start up
Inception Report	Project Team, through Project Mgr UNDP CO	None	Immediately following IW

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators	Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop. Indicative cost: 15,000.	Start, mid and end of project
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis)	Oversight by Project Manager Project team	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation. Indicative cost: 4,000 (annually); total: 24,000	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR and PIR	Project Team, through Project Mgr UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF	None	Annually
Quarterly progress reports	Project team, through Project Mgr	None	Quarterly
CDRs	Project Manager	None	Quarterly
Issues Log	Project Manager UNDP CO Programme Staff	None	Quarterly
Risks Log	Project Manager UNDP CO Programme Staff	None	Quarterly
Lessons Learned Log	Project Manager UNDP CO Programme Staff	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	Project team UNDP- CO UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	40,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	Project team, UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	40,000	At the end of project implementation
Terminal Report	Project team UNDP-CO local consultant	0	At least one month before the end of the project
Lessons learned	Project team UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit (suggested formats for documenting best practices, etc)	12,000 (average 2,000 per year from year 2)	Yearly
Audit	UNDP-CO Project team	24,000 (average of 4,000 per year)	Yearly
Visits to field sites	Project team UNDP CO UNDP RCU (as appropriate) Government representatives	GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST		US\$ 180,000	

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
<i>Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses</i>			


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/DD/YYYY)
DANA A. KARTAKUSUMA GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT	SPECIAL ADVISOR	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT	04/09/2012

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu UNDP/GEF Executive Coordinator, UNDP		12/19/2014	Midori Paxton, Regional Technical Advisor, EBD, UNDP	+66-98824- 7330	midori.paxton@ undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Project Title: Transforming effectiveness of biodiversity conservation in priority Sumatran landscapes

Project's Development Goal: To contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in Indonesia

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions																		
<p>Objective:</p> <p>To enhance biodiversity conservation in priority landscapes in Sumatra through adoption of best management practices in protected areas and adjacent production landscapes, using tiger recovery as a key indicator of success</p>	<p>Sumatran tiger density Increase in Sumatran tiger density* by >10% in core area in 4 target landscapes**:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Landscape</th> <th>Density Baseline Estimate (2013)</th> <th>Density Target Estimate (PY5)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Leuser Ecosystem</td> <td>0.52 (0.27-0.99)</td> <td>0.57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kerinci Seblat</td> <td>1.13 (0.64-2.00)</td> <td>1.24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bukit Barisan Selatan</td> <td>n/a [1.56 (1.2-3.2)[§]]</td> <td>1.72</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Berbak-Sembilang</td> <td>1.02 (0.50-1.51)</td> <td>1.12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average score for 4 landscapes</td> <td>1.06</td> <td>1.17</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Landscape	Density Baseline Estimate (2013)	Density Target Estimate (PY5)	Leuser Ecosystem	0.52 (0.27-0.99)	0.57	Kerinci Seblat	1.13 (0.64-2.00)	1.24	Bukit Barisan Selatan	n/a [1.56 (1.2-3.2) [§]]	1.72	Berbak-Sembilang	1.02 (0.50-1.51)	1.12	Average score for 4 landscapes	1.06	1.17	<p>See inset table for Density baseline metrics.</p>	<p>EOP: Increase in Sumatran tiger density* by >10% in core area in 4 target landscapes**: See inset table for Density target metrics.</p> <p>See inset table for Density target metrics.</p> <p>Y1: Standardized field survey design and protocol (to become <i>PHKA</i> regulation) developed for tiger density (camera trapping)</p> <p>Y2: Annual camera trap surveys initiated for core tiger areas</p> <p>Y3: Landscape-level tiger occurrence mapped and priority sites inside and outside PAs identified for targeted protection actions</p> <p>Y4: Existing data monitoring systems reviewed and upgraded to</p>	<p>Project reports on Density results.</p>	<p><u>Risks:</u></p> <p>Exploitation of tigers and forest products dramatically increase due to heightened international trade that puts the control of these drivers of change beyond the project's intervention.</p> <p>Climate change may undermine conservation objectives of the project.</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u></p> <p>Poaching and habitat loss are the primary threats to tigers and their prey, and the project's design enables their reduction and results in a tiger</p>
	Landscape	Density Baseline Estimate (2013)	Density Target Estimate (PY5)																				
	Leuser Ecosystem	0.52 (0.27-0.99)	0.57																				
	Kerinci Seblat	1.13 (0.64-2.00)	1.24																				
	Bukit Barisan Selatan	n/a [1.56 (1.2-3.2) [§]]	1.72																				
	Berbak-Sembilang	1.02 (0.50-1.51)	1.12																				
	Average score for 4 landscapes	1.06	1.17																				
<p>*Density = number of adult individual tigers/100km² (± 95% CIs)</p>																							
<p>**4 landscapes that contain 5 NPs. Kampar is not included</p>																							
<p>[§] Estimate is from 1999 (O'Brien et al. 2003 Crouching tigers, hidden prey: Sumatran tiger and prey populations in a tropical forest landscape. <i>Animal Conservation</i> 6:131-139). Calculated using strip-width boundary method and not SECR method, which</p>																							

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions																		
	<p>slightly lowers the density estimate.</p> <p>The camera trap sampling design for estimating tiger density is described in detail in Pickles et al. (2014) Running a Camera Trap Grid. Panthera Field Manual Series, PFM03. [http://www.panthera.org/tigersforeverresources]</p>		<p>establish key species monitoring database (including tiger)</p> <p>Y5: Final tiger density assessment indicates increase of >10% in core area per target landscape over 2013 baseline estimate.</p>		<p>population increase.</p>																		
<p>Outcome 1:</p> <p>Increased effectiveness of key protected area management institutions</p>	<p>Outputs:</p> <p>1.1. Management capacity increased in target protected areas through training and technical assistance. 1.2. Enhanced management and annual plans developed, adopted and implemented 1.3. Adaptive management law enforcement tools and standards, such as SMART, are implemented in priority RBMs in target landscapes. 1.4. Management effectiveness increase annually tracked through training results and METT* assessments. 1.5 Updated version of the National Tiger Recovery Plan and Sumatran Tiger Strategy and Action Plan developed and adopted. [*A proposed refinement of METT adapted specifically for the Indonesian PA system context and retaining consistency with METT for project M&E]</p> <p>1.1. Capacity Development Score Improved institutional capacity of the 5 target protected area authorities for management as indicated by the Capacity Development Scorecard (see Annex 3):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="296 927 970 1386"> <thead> <tr> <th>Protected Area</th> <th>Capacity Development Baseline Score (2014)</th> <th>Capacity Development Target Score (PY5)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Gunung Leuser NP</td> <td>69%</td> <td>83%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kerinci Seblat NP</td> <td>72%</td> <td>85%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bukit Barisan Selatan NP</td> <td>71%</td> <td>81%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Berbak NP</td> <td>69%</td> <td>83%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sembilang NP</td> <td>69%</td> <td>83%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Protected Area	Capacity Development Baseline Score (2014)	Capacity Development Target Score (PY5)	Gunung Leuser NP	69%	83%	Kerinci Seblat NP	72%	85%	Bukit Barisan Selatan NP	71%	81%	Berbak NP	69%	83%	Sembilang NP	69%	83%	<p>See inset table for Capacity Development Scorecard baseline.</p>	<p>EOP: Improved institutional capacity of the 5 target protected area authorities for management as indicated by the Capacity Development Scorecard (see Annex 3): Y1: skill gaps and management training needs identified for 5 target NPs based on professional competency standards</p> <p>Y2: Key NP personnel trained using accredited thematic skill training modules</p> <p>Y3: Mid term assessment</p>	<p>Project reports on Capacity Development Scorecard.</p>	<p><u>Risks:</u></p> <p>Insufficient government commitment at all levels is secured to achieve the project objective.</p> <p>Failure to learn from previous experiences of biodiversity conservation in Sumatra that were not successful</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <p>The Ministry of Forestry continues to be</p>
Protected Area	Capacity Development Baseline Score (2014)	Capacity Development Target Score (PY5)																					
Gunung Leuser NP	69%	83%																					
Kerinci Seblat NP	72%	85%																					
Bukit Barisan Selatan NP	71%	81%																					
Berbak NP	69%	83%																					
Sembilang NP	69%	83%																					

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions																		
			<p>of CD scorecards indicates at least 40% progress towards end of project targets over baseline.</p> <p>Y4: Available equipment and needs for RBM reviewed and recommendations made to PHKA to supply/upgrade essential equipment</p> <p>Y5: End of project assessment of CD scorecards - see targets in the inset table</p>		<p>committed to improved capacity of the PA institution through deploying a sufficient number of competent staff and having the budget to do so.</p>																		
	<p>1.2. SMART-RBM Threat Encounter Reports Reduction of tiger-related threats by >10% in each of the 5 target PAs indicated by a reduction in the number of illegal activities as shown in SMART-RBM monthly patrolling reports*:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="296 906 1026 1198"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="296 906 617 971">Protected Area</th> <th data-bbox="617 906 842 971">SMART Baseline (2013)</th> <th data-bbox="842 906 1026 971">SMART Target (PY5)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 971 617 1008">Gunung Leuser NP</td> <td data-bbox="617 971 842 1008">43.0</td> <td data-bbox="842 971 1026 1008">39.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 1008 617 1045">Kerinci Seblat NP</td> <td data-bbox="617 1008 842 1045">44.0</td> <td data-bbox="842 1008 1026 1045">39.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 1045 617 1083">Bukit Barisan Selatan NP</td> <td data-bbox="617 1045 842 1083">2.0</td> <td data-bbox="842 1045 1026 1083">1.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 1083 617 1120">Berbak NP</td> <td data-bbox="617 1083 842 1120">0.22</td> <td data-bbox="842 1083 1026 1120">0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 1120 617 1198">Sembilang NP</td> <td data-bbox="617 1120 842 1198">0.00[#]</td> <td data-bbox="842 1120 1026 1198">0.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Encounter rate: average number of tiger and prey snare traps removed/100km of forest patrol [#]No snare traps were encountered in 2013, and a new baseline will be explored.</p>	Protected Area	SMART Baseline (2013)	SMART Target (PY5)	Gunung Leuser NP	43.0	39.0	Kerinci Seblat NP	44.0	39.0	Bukit Barisan Selatan NP	2.0	1.0	Berbak NP	0.22	0.00	Sembilang NP	0.00 [#]	0.00	<p>See inset table for baseline rate of number of illegal activities recorded per year per 100km patrolled in each PA.</p>	<p>EOP: Reduction of tiger-related threats by >10% in each of the 5 target PAs indicated by a reduction in the number of illegal activities as shown in SMART-RBM monthly patrolling reports* (see inset table)</p> <p>Y1: RBM implementation status, current patrolling system and LE capacity in target NPs reviewed and management recommendations presented; Routine RBM-SMART forest patrols, data analysis and strategic</p>	<p>SMART monthly patrolling reports for each PA.</p>	<p><u>Risks:</u></p> <p>A lack of suitable ranger candidates and technical support staff results in ineffective patrolling and incomplete adaptive management systems.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <p>Ranger candidates are selected based on merit (past record), ability and motivation and sufficiently resourced and supported to</p>
Protected Area	SMART Baseline (2013)	SMART Target (PY5)																					
Gunung Leuser NP	43.0	39.0																					
Kerinci Seblat NP	44.0	39.0																					
Bukit Barisan Selatan NP	2.0	1.0																					
Berbak NP	0.22	0.00																					
Sembilang NP	0.00 [#]	0.00																					

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions						
			<p>planning initiated</p> <p>Y2: Thematic RBM-SMART workshops conducted for target NPs to initiate RBM-SMART system; Annual RBM-SMART evaluations initiated at resort, NP and national levels</p> <p>Y3: Annual RBM-SMART training reviews and updates conducted.</p> <p>Y4: Lessons learned from Annual RBM-SMART evaluations at resort, NP and national levels shared and evaluated for upscaling across national PA system</p> <p>Y5: See inset table for end of project target rate of number of illegal activities recorded per year per 100km patrolled in each PA.</p>		perform their duties.						
	<p>1.3. Law Enforcement Patrol Effort Increase in law enforcement patrol effort (km walked per year) by >10% in each of the 5 target PAs as shown in SMART-RBM monthly patrolling reports*:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="296 1312 1018 1442"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="296 1312 621 1401">Protected Area</th> <th data-bbox="621 1312 825 1401">Forest Patrol Baseline (2013)</th> <th data-bbox="825 1312 1018 1401">Forest Patrol Target (PY5)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 1401 621 1442">Gunung Leuser NP</td> <td data-bbox="621 1401 825 1442">237</td> <td data-bbox="825 1401 1018 1442">261</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Protected Area	Forest Patrol Baseline (2013)	Forest Patrol Target (PY5)	Gunung Leuser NP	237	261	See inset table for baseline number of forest patrol kilometres walked per year in PA and adjacent	EOP: Increase in law enforcement patrol effort (km walked per year) by >10% in each of the 5 target PAs as shown in SMART-RBM monthly patrolling reports* (see inset table)	SMART monthly patrolling reports for each PA.	<p><u>Risks:</u></p> <p>A lack of suitable ranger candidates and technical support staff results in ineffective patrolling and</p>
Protected Area	Forest Patrol Baseline (2013)	Forest Patrol Target (PY5)									
Gunung Leuser NP	237	261									

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator		Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions	
	Kerinci Seblat NP	1722	1895	forests.	<p>Y1: RBM implementation status, current patrolling system and LE capacity in target NPs reviewed and management recommendations presented; Routine RBM-SMART forest patrols, data analysis and strategic planning initiated</p> <p>Y2: Thematic RBM-SMART workshops conducted for target NPs to initiate RBM-SMART system; Annual RBM-SMART evaluations initiated at resort, NP and national levels</p> <p>Y3: Annual RBM-SMART training reviews and updates conducted.</p> <p>Y4: Lessons learned from Annual RBM-SMART evaluations at resort, NP and national levels shared and evaluated for upscaling across national PA system</p> <p>Y5: See inset table for end of project target number of forest patrol kilometres walked per year in PA and adjacent forests.</p>		<p>incomplete adaptive management systems</p> <p><u>Assumption:</u></p> <p>Ranger candidates are selected based on merit (past record), ability and motivation and sufficiently resourced and supported to perform their duties.</p>
Bukit Barisan Selatan NP	1023	1126					
Berbak NP	464	511					
Sembilang NP	320	352					
	1.4. Forest Degradation Rates		Deforestation rate baseline	EOP: Forest degradation*	Project	<u>Risks:</u>	

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	<p>Forest degradation* rates in core areas in 5 target protected areas reduced to <1% by end of project [baseline to be set in Project Year 1]</p> <p>*Forest degradation is defined as forest located inside a PA's core area that has completely become non-forest but retains its PA status.</p>	to be calculated in PY1.	<p>rates in core areas in 5 target protected areas reduced to <1% by end of project.</p> <p>Y1: Forest cover data sets/methodologies reviewed and methodological protocol confirmed</p> <p>Y2: Forest cover assessments completed for 5 NPs with MoF / Planologi as part of routine monitoring system and encroachment hotspots identified for management action</p> <p>Y3: Targeted interventions reduce encroachment incidence at identified hotspots</p> <p>Y4: Targeted interventions continue to reduce encroachment at identified hotspots</p> <p>Y5: Final forest cover assessment completed. Deforestation rates target to be <1% by PY5.</p>	reports on deforestation rates.	<p>PA institutions are unwilling to tackle illegal forest conversion and lack the capacity and resources to do so.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <p>PA regulations do not change and enable enforcement of borders from encroachment, whilst forest ranger teams are well-trained and able to address this threat.</p>

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions																		
	<p>1.5. Management Effectiveness (METT Score) Improved management effectiveness of 5 target protected areas* covering 3,185,359 ha, indicated by the increase in the METT assessment (see Annex 2):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="296 329 968 737"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="296 329 600 423">Protected Area</th> <th data-bbox="600 329 793 423">METT Baseline Score (2014)</th> <th data-bbox="793 329 968 423">METT Target Score (PY5)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 423 600 485">Gunung Leuser NP</td> <td data-bbox="600 423 793 485">63%</td> <td data-bbox="793 423 968 485">76%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 485 600 547">Kerinci Seblat NP</td> <td data-bbox="600 485 793 547">64%</td> <td data-bbox="793 485 968 547">76%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 547 600 609">Bukit Barisan Selatan NP</td> <td data-bbox="600 547 793 609">69%</td> <td data-bbox="793 547 968 609">77%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 609 600 670">Berbak NP</td> <td data-bbox="600 609 793 670">53%</td> <td data-bbox="793 609 968 670">75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 670 600 737">Sembilang NP</td> <td data-bbox="600 670 793 737">59%</td> <td data-bbox="793 670 968 737">75%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Note – this only includes the legally gazetted National Parks, not the surrounding production landscapes</p>	Protected Area	METT Baseline Score (2014)	METT Target Score (PY5)	Gunung Leuser NP	63%	76%	Kerinci Seblat NP	64%	76%	Bukit Barisan Selatan NP	69%	77%	Berbak NP	53%	75%	Sembilang NP	59%	75%	See inset table for METT Baseline scores.	<p>EOP: Improved management effectiveness of 5 target protected areas* covering 3,185,359 ha, indicated by the increase in the METT assessment (see Annex 2). See inset table.</p> <p>Y1: METT toolkit tailored for Indonesia’s PA system developed by PHKA Working Group; review and revision of 10 year mgt plans for 5 target PAs; Skill gaps and management training needs identified for 5 target NPs based on professional competency standards</p> <p>Y2: High quality annual workplans developed that support performance based incentives</p> <p>Y3: Mid term METT assessment for 5 target NPs indicates 50% progress towards targets</p> <p>Y4: High quality annual workplans developed that support performance based incentives</p> <p>Y5: See inset table for end</p>	Project reports on METT applied at PPG, midterm and project completion.	<p><u>Risks:</u></p> <p>There is a reorientation of economic development priorities and policies leading to a change in land use plans to the detriment of the PA system.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <p>The Ministry of Forestry continues to be committed to improved management of the PA system despite competing demands for land and resources.</p>
Protected Area	METT Baseline Score (2014)	METT Target Score (PY5)																					
Gunung Leuser NP	63%	76%																					
Kerinci Seblat NP	64%	76%																					
Bukit Barisan Selatan NP	69%	77%																					
Berbak NP	53%	75%																					
Sembilang NP	59%	75%																					

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions						
			of project METT Target scores for 5 target NPs; METT introduced as routine monitoring system for national PA system.								
Outcome 2: Intersectoral coordination systems are developed for priority landscapes	Outputs: 2.1. Landscape-level and inter-landscape partnerships developed and operationalized between relevant agencies concerned with illegal wildlife trade ⁸ . 2.2. Innovative forest and wildlife management interventions in target landscapes documented and reviewed for replication and upscaling, a) Community Carbon Pool-Village Forest (<i>Hutan Desa</i>) scheme buffering Kerinci Seblat NP (supported by FFI) b) Priority wildlife habitat conserved in production area for Kampar (supported by FFI) c) Village forest restoration in Berbak NP (supported by ZSL, TFCA project) d) ‘Smart Green Infrastructure’ guidelines towards roads evaluated and tailored or tiger landscapes, in cooperation with GTI (supported by <i>HarimauKita</i>). 2.3. Management decision-making informed through wildlife and forest monitoring using a standardised scientific survey protocol. 2.4 Human-tiger conflicts effectively managed in 5 target landscapes.										
	2.1. Number of Wildlife Crime Cases Submitted for Prosecution Number of wildlife crime cases submitted for prosecution from operations conducted at island level as a result of intersectoral collaboration increases by >25%: <table border="1" data-bbox="296 1068 1016 1325"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="296 1068 600 1255">Landscape</th> <th data-bbox="600 1068 814 1255">Number of cases submitted Baseline (2013)</th> <th data-bbox="814 1068 1016 1255">Annual number of cases submitted Target Score (PY5)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 1255 600 1325">Gunung Leuser</td> <td data-bbox="600 1255 814 1325">3</td> <td data-bbox="814 1255 1016 1325">9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Landscape	Number of cases submitted Baseline (2013)	Annual number of cases submitted Target Score (PY5)	Gunung Leuser	3	9	See inset table for 2013 baseline number of arrests in project landscapes.	EOP: Number of wildlife crime cases submitted for prosecution from operations conducted at island level as a result of intersectoral collaboration increases by >25% (see inset table). Y1: Law enforcement capacity and needs reviewed and	Project reports on law enforcement.	Risks: Law enforcement personnel and agencies do not support inter-agency collaborations and lack interest in the project objectives. <u>Assumption:</u> High willingness between different agencies to cooperate at
Landscape	Number of cases submitted Baseline (2013)	Annual number of cases submitted Target Score (PY5)									
Gunung Leuser	3	9									

⁸ PA authorities, SPORC, BKSDA, local government, police, prosecutors and judges, media

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator			Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	Kerinci Seblat	3			<p>recommendations lead to action plan being developed for Sumatra</p> <p>Y2: Most effective local informant models identified and enhanced / replicated in landscape-wide initiatives, and principles developed for the adoption of informant networks into law enforcement system</p> <p>Y3: Informant networks operational and supported in 4 target landscapes</p> <p>Y4: Informant networks operational and supported in 4 target landscapes</p> <p>Y5: See inset table for end of project target number of arrests in project landscapes.</p>		national and landscape levels; prosecutors are well-trained and competent; judiciary understands the importance of illegal wildlife trade and pertaining laws; an increased number of arrests and prosecutions is a sufficient deterrent for lowering poaching.
	<p>2.2. Number of Agency Staff participating in Pilot Projects At least 25 staff of the Ministry of Forestry, Provincial/District level authorities and/or regional development planning authorities (e.g. <i>Bappeda</i> and Public Works) participate in the process of piloting five innovative forest/biodiversity projects.</p>			0 people involved	<p>EOP: At least 25 staff of the Ministry of Forestry, Provincial/District level authorities and/or regional development planning authorities (e.g. <i>Bappeda</i> and Public Works) participate in the process of piloting five innovative forest/biodiversity projects.</p> <p>Y1: Implementation plans developed for GEF project</p>	Project reports on forest/wildlife management interventions outside PAs.	<p><u>Risks:</u></p> <p>Lack of support from industrial sector stakeholders</p> <p>Uncertainty in REDD+ development</p>

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			<p>engagement with 5 cofinanced pilot innovative forest/ biodiversity projects</p> <p>Y2: Evaluations conducted of 5 cofinanced forest / biodiversity projects outside NPs in target landscapes, including potential for replicability in other landscapes;</p> <p>Y3: Learnings from 5 pilot projects developed as a series of best management practice case studies; site exchange visits from targeted stakeholder audiences</p> <p>Y4: Continued site exchange visits / training for targeted stakeholder audiences and promotion of replication / upscaling</p> <p>Y5: Continued site exchange visits / training for targeted stakeholder audiences and promotion of replication / upscaling; total of at least 25 key stakeholders trained.</p>		<p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <p>High levels of interest amongst different agencies and perception that interventions are a useful alternative for management outside PAs.</p>
	<p>2.3. Tiger, Prey and Forest Habitat Monitoring System Standardised tiger, prey and forest habitat monitoring system</p>	<p>0 systems in place</p>	<p>EOP: Standardised tiger, prey and forest habitat</p>	<p>Project report on biological</p>	<p><u>Risks:</u></p>

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	developed and operationalized for 5 target protected areas and their surrounding landscapes.		<p>monitoring system developed and operationalized for 5 target protected areas and their surrounding landscapes.</p> <p>Y1: Standardized field survey design and protocols for biological monitoring developed;</p> <p>PHKA accredited training modules developed;</p> <p>Y2: Training provided through PusDikLat to NP technical units and NGOs in biological monitoring methods (wildlife and forest)</p> <p>Y3: National and NP data management systems reviewed as a basis for developing key species monitoring data base</p> <p>Y4: Annual workplans for NPs include biological monitoring and associated data management tasks</p> <p>Y5: Biological monitoring systems in place and operational at five target NPs by end of project</p>	surveys.	<p>Financial resources are not adequate to support surveys at a sufficient level of scientific rigor.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <p>Trained personnel stay actively involved in conducting surveys and correctly follow protocol.</p>

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	<p>2.4. Human-Tiger Conflict Report Assessments / Responses >95% of human-tiger conflict reports are correctly assessed and/or responded in accordance with <i>PHKA</i> mitigation protocol⁹ P48, by Project Year 3.</p>	<p>Variable response rates amongst landscapes. Problem tiger reports are not systematically logged and tracked preventing the development of accurate baselines.</p>	<p>EOP: >95% of human-tiger conflict reports are correctly assessed and/or responded in accordance with <i>PHKA</i> mitigation protocol¹⁰ P48, by Project Year 3.</p> <p>Y1: Socialisation and implementation of the human-tiger conflict mitigation protocol (P48) reviewed and next steps identified.</p> <p>Y2: One Conflict Mitigation Coordination Team established in each of the 4 NP landscapes, SOP developed and supervision provided.</p> <p>Y3-5: >95% of human-tiger conflict reports are correctly assessed and/or responded to in accordance with <i>PHKA</i> mitigation protocol¹¹ P48.</p>	<p>Project report on human-tiger conflict.</p>	<p><u>Risks:</u></p> <p>Personnel and agencies targeted for wildlife conflict mitigation support do not support inter-agency collaboration and lack interest in the project.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <p>Conflict mitigation teams are adequately trained and resourced and therefore able to correctly perform core duties.</p>

⁹ PerMen.48/2008

¹⁰ PerMen.48/2008

¹¹ PerMen.48/2008

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
Outcome 3: Sustainable financing for biodiversity management in priority landscapes	Outputs: 3.1. Financial sustainability analysis conducted to improve cost-effectiveness, disbursement mechanisms and budget resources for UPT 3.2. Sustainable financing plans developed and implemented for selected production areas through business and biodiversity mechanisms 3.3 Institutional framework at national level adopted to support sustainable financing scheme implementation				
	3.1. Financing Plans Five new financing plans in place for selected target PAs by the project end and budgets increased by 10%.	0 financing plans in place, and 2014 budget baselines are from the NPs and partnering CSOs.	EOP: Five new financing plans in place for selected target PAs by the project end and budgets increased by 10%. Y1: - Y2: Funding road map (business plan) developed for 5 NPs using existing government funding allocations (including Env. Law No. 32 of 2009) post financial review and identification of external sources. Y3: new sustainable financing mechanisms developed through exploring options with potential donors in Indonesia to specific target NPs and priority tiger conservation activities. Y5: Multi - donor workshop convened by PHKA for supporting key	Project reports on financing mechanisms.	<u>Risks:</u> Government agencies do not view PA management as important to their own objectives; Lack of conservation funding for biodiversity-rich habitats outside protected areas Change in external donor priorities results in reduced support to Indonesia and forestry sector. <u>Assumption:</u> Sufficient financing opportunities exist and donor are willing to

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			aspects of the National Tiger Recovery Plan; New financing plans in place for the 5 target NPs by end of project and budgets increased by 10%.		consider modifications for their criteria so that it better aligns with project objectives.
	<p>3.2. Sustainable Financing Plans for Production Areas involving PPPs</p> <p>Two sustainable financing plans produced for production area/s through business and biodiversity mechanisms (PES, private sector endowment and corporate social responsibility schemes and biodiversity offsetting) involving public-private partnerships (PPPs).</p>	0 plans in place.	<p>EOP: Two sustainable financing plans produced for production area/s through business and biodiversity mechanisms (PES, private sector endowment and corporate social responsibility schemes and biodiversity offsetting) involving public-private partnerships (PPPs).</p> <p>Y1: -</p> <p>Y2: -</p> <p>Y3: Review of sustainable financing options for conservation activities outside the PA system completed; Two PPPs established for sustainable financing of conservation in production areas.</p> <p>Y4: Two sustainable financing plans produced</p>	Project reports on financing mechanisms.	

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions															
			<p>for production area/s through business and biodiversity mechanisms involving PPPs.</p> <p>Y5: 2 sustainable financing plans received funding and activity implementation begins.</p>																	
	<p>3.3. Financial Sustainability Scorecard</p> <p>Increase by >25% for each of the three component scores in the Financial Sustainability Scorecard for the sub-system of Sumatra's protected areas*:</p> <p>*10 National Parks (Batang Gadis, Berbak, Bukit Barisan Selatan, Bukit Duabelas, Bukit Tiga Puluh, Gunung Leuser, Kerinci Seblat, Sembilang, Tesso Nilo and Way Kambas)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="296 735 1020 1273"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="296 735 548 818">Component</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="548 735 1020 818">Financial Sustainability Scorecard score (%)</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 818 548 862"></td> <th data-bbox="548 818 783 862">Baseline (2014)</th> <th data-bbox="783 818 1020 862">Target (PY5)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 862 548 1016">1. Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks</td> <td data-bbox="548 862 783 1016">42%</td> <td data-bbox="783 862 1020 1016">53%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 1016 548 1203">2. Business planning and tools for cost-effective management</td> <td data-bbox="548 1016 783 1203">24%</td> <td data-bbox="783 1016 1020 1203">30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="296 1203 548 1273">3. Tools for revenue generation</td> <td data-bbox="548 1203 783 1273">35%</td> <td data-bbox="783 1203 1020 1273">44%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Component	Financial Sustainability Scorecard score (%)			Baseline (2014)	Target (PY5)	1. Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks	42%	53%	2. Business planning and tools for cost-effective management	24%	30%	3. Tools for revenue generation	35%	44%	<p>See inset table for baseline scores on financial sustainability.</p>	<p>EOP: Increase by >25% for each of the three component scores in the Financial Sustainability Scorecard for the sub-system of Sumatra's protected areas* (see inset table)</p> <p>Y1: -</p> <p>Y2: -</p> <p>Y3: Review of existing laws, regulations and policies completed including recommendations to enable revenue flow to PAs from non-governmental sources; Mid term assessment of financial scorecard shows 40% progress towards targets</p> <p>Y4: Removal of barriers to</p>	<p>Project reports on PA financing; financial scorecard repeat assessment in PY5</p>	
Component	Financial Sustainability Scorecard score (%)																			
	Baseline (2014)	Target (PY5)																		
1. Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks	42%	53%																		
2. Business planning and tools for cost-effective management	24%	30%																		
3. Tools for revenue generation	35%	44%																		

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	EOP and Annual Project Targets	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			<p>sustainable financing of the PA system as far as possible through project support to legislation revisions.</p> <p>Y5: See inset table for end of project target scores on financial sustainability</p>		

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Note: No comments from STAP were received.

Comments	Responses	References Pr Doc
Responses to GEF Secretariat review at Work Programme inclusion – October 3, 2012		
<p>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?</p> <p>03/23/2012: Preliminary information is provided, however more information has to be given on the involvement of the local communities and local authorities and how they will benefit from the project. At CEO endorsement stage, more detailed and accurate data is expected.</p> <p>04/05/2012: Addressed. At CEO endorsement stage, more detailed and accurate data is expected.</p>	<p>During the PPG phase, consultations were conducted for each of the target landscapes including a wide range of stakeholders. Summary reports on these consultations are presented in Annex 4 of the Project Document, and further information on local stakeholders and related land use issues are provided in the Landscape Profiles in Annex 1. The project’s approach to stakeholder engagement is explained in the Stakeholder Involvement Plan (Section B1 above and prodoc Section IV Part IV) which will be further reviewed and fine-tuned during the project inception period. Socio-economic benefits are described in Section B2 above and prodoc Section I Part II (strategy).</p>	<p>Section IV; Annex 4</p>
<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p> <p>03/23/2012: Yes, the project will be led by the Ministry of Forestry and implementation will be coordinated by an advisory board, however, please explain how the local communities and local authorities will be involved, represented.</p>	<p>At the landscape level of project management organization, project implementation units will be established for each landscape, led by the relevant protected area management authority and involving other local agencies concerned with conservation issues. The involvement of other local authorities and communities will be achieved at the activity level.</p> <p>Implementation of the project’s Stakeholder Involvement Plan will start out with identifying key communities within each PA landscape to work with on specific issues, according to baseline information and consultations during the PPG (see prodoc Annex 1 and 4. It recognizes the need for strong CBOs as effective partners for sustainable PA management, and will seek to strengthen existing CBOs and develop new CBOs to fulfil such roles. The CBOs will be responsible for specific tasks at the demonstration sites and will be supported by central project management and the PA management teams. Each partnering NGO will appoint experienced staff to act as focal points for community engagement and development, and will assign and train community facilitators to lead the community participation and capacity development processes. The project will also strengthen the representation of stakeholders including local communities on committees supporting site management. There will be proactive consideration of the involvement of women and ethnic minorities on local level committees and groups related to</p>	<p>Part III; IV Part 1; Annex</p>

	<p>project activities including community co-management, training and awareness activities. See the Stakeholder Participation Plan in Section B1 above and Prodoc Section IV Part IV for further details.</p>	
<p>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. 03/23/2012: Please, ensure that the following issues are addressed at the Request for CEO Endorsement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear and measurable outputs and outcomes are defined 2. Co-financing is confirmed 3. Implementation arrangements with partners and local authorities are well set-up 4. CSOs and private sector are well involved in the project implementation 5. A full risk analysis 6. GEF TT are included 7. Strong evidence of Global Environmental Benefits and GEF incremental value are presented 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clear and measurable outputs and outcomes have been defined and are presented in the Strategy Section of the Project Document, as well as the Strategic Results Framework (Annex A above), the elaboration of project indicators (prodoc Table 9), Annual Work Plan (Annex 9) and Work Plan Matrix (Annex 10),. 2. Cofinancing has been confirmed for the project. See Table C above, and the Cofinancing confirmation letters in Section IV Part 1 of the Project Document. 3. See response to Q20 above. 4. The project builds direct on the on-going programmes between the government and the four project partners CSOs listed in the PIF (FFI, WCS, ZSL and Forum HarimauKita). They provide co-financing and their operation will form integral parts of the project activities. In addition, they will be considered for implementation of packages of activities defined in the Terms of Reference in Annex 11 of the project document. In addition to their technical assistance inputs, these CSO partners will also participate in landscape level teams for joint operations towards controlling threats from poaching, illegal wildlife trade and forest encroachment. At the national level, they will be represented in the project's Project Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee. At the local level, the project will engage local CSOs and NGOs in specific activities through the project's Stakeholder Involvement Plan. Private sector stakeholders including APRIL (which will contribute significant cofinancing through collaborative activities with FFI) will be engaged in demonstration activities in Component 2 of the project. 5. The risk analysis in the PIF has been extended and updated including the identification of mitigation measures through the project's approach. See the Risk Log in Table 10 of the prodoc. 6. The GEF Biodiversity 1 Tracking Tool has been completed, with METT scorecards for all five targeted protected areas (Annex 2), and a Financial Scorecard assessment (Annex 2A) covering the 10 National Parks in the Sumatra sub-component of the national PA system. 7. Strong evidence of Global Environmental Benefits and GEF incremental value are presented in the incremental reasoning and incremental costs analysis sections of the prodoc, and reflected in the Strategic Results Framework. This specifically includes strengthened management effectiveness, capacity and sustainable financing for the five target protected areas covering 3,185,359 ha, as well as threat 	<p>Section I Part II; Section II Part I; Table 9; Annex 9; Annex 10.</p> <p>Section IV Part I</p> <p>Section I Part III Section I Part III; Annex 12</p> <p>Section I Part II; Table 10</p> <p>Annex 2; Annex 2A</p> <p>Section I Part II; Section II Part I; Section II Part II</p>

	<p>reduction and strengthened responses to human-tiger conflict events in the wider landscapes covering some 5 million ha. The project's success will be indicated by an increase in Sumatran tiger density of over 10% in the core areas of the target landscapes in line with the National Tiger Recovery Plan. It will also benefit the diversity of tropical forest and wetland habitats within these large landscapes and a wide array of other species including charismatic endangered species such as orang-utan, Sumatran rhinoceros, Sumatran elephant and so on.</p>	
<p>Comments by GEF Council Members on the Work Program approved by Council in June, 2012</p>		
<p>Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:</p> <p>The project target is to increase the management effectiveness in priority Sumatran landscapes and ecosystems. The project proposal is based on a plausible impact and intervention logic, and explains how the endangered landscapes could be preserved.</p> <p>A) Nevertheless, only little attention is paid to stakeholders which in many cases are the cause of environmental degradation (e.g. smallholders and their organizations – as being economic drivers of biodiversity loss). They should be analyzed and specified in more detail and included in the final proposal. A hypothesis should state how and why their behavior/interest should change by the impact of the project.</p> <p>B) The project measures make poaching or illegal logging more difficult, but it is pointed out that in particular for a number of organized stakeholders and institutions the economic interest of the poaching and illegal logging business remains high. This should be addressed adequately in the final proposal.</p>	<p>A) Stakeholders that are involved in environmental degradation will be engaged by the project through a number of approaches. Under the first project component, the project will support local stakeholder involvement in PA management activities and through representation on stakeholder committees for each target PA, as well as related education and awareness programmes guided by the project communications strategy. Given that local stakeholders are not resident inside the protected areas, engagement of local communities will be primarily through innovative forest and wildlife management demonstration interventions in target landscapes under the second component of the project, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Community Carbon Pool-Village Forest (Hutan Desa) scheme buffering Kerinci Seblat NP (supported by FFI) b) Priority wildlife habitat conserved in production area for Kampar (supported by FFI) c) Village forest restoration in Berbak NP (supported by ZSL, TFCA project) d) 'Smart Green Infrastructure' guidelines towards roads evaluated and tailored or tiger landscapes, in cooperation with GTI (supported by HarimauKita). e) Development of sustainable agricultural commodities in Bukit Barisan Selatan and Gunung Leuser National Parks (supported by WCS). <p>B) It is unclear what practical measures could be taken to reduce the economic interest of poaching and illegal logging as they are driven by international (black) market forces. Therefore, the project's approach of systematically strengthening monitoring and enforcement capacity and techniques, increasing local awareness levels regarding biodiversity conservation and related laws, coupled with the provision of alternatives through the pilot demonstrations in Component 2 mentioned above, as well as improved responses to assist communities in handling human-tiger conflict events represent the best available integrated approach to reduce the prevalence of such illegal activities.</p>	<p>Section I Part II; Section I Part III;</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹²

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved: US\$ 100,000

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent to date	Amount Committed
Activity 1: Sumatra and Protected Area Landscape Profiling	20,000.00	14,189.00	5,811.00
Activity 2: Policy Framework & Institutional Capacity Review, and Baseline Assessment	10,000.00	7,094.50	2,905.50
Activity 3: Local stakeholder and gender assessment	10,000.00	7,094.50	2,905.50
Activity 4: Development of biodiversity pressure, state, response indicators, with baseline and targets	15,000.00	10,641.75	4,358.25
Activity 5: GEF Tracking Tool Baseline Assessment	15,000.00	10,641.75	4,358.25
Activity 6: Environmental and Social Screening Procedure (ESSP)	5,000.00	3,547.25	1,452.75
Activity 7: Project Activity Development, Feasibility Analysis and Budget Development	25,000.00	17,736.25	7,263.75
Total	100,000.00	70,945.01	29,054.99

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A

¹² If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.