



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

GEF ID:	5759		
Country/Region:	Indonesia		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Inland Fisheries Practices in Freshwater Ecosystems of High Conservation Value		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$6,192,694
Co-financing:	\$31,106,000	Total Project Cost:	\$37,498,694
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Devin Bartley

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	03/20/2014: Yes.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	03/20/2014: Yes, in a letter dated March 5, 2014.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	03/20/2014: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	03/20/2014: Yes	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	30/20/2014: N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or	30/20/2014: N/A	

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	30/20/2014: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	30/20/2014: N/A	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCE/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>03/20/2014: The project is aligned with the BD focal area strategy. The project has explicitly articulated the Aichi Targets that it will help to achieve. SMART indicators haven't been identified, please develop them under Table B.</p> <p>03/24/2014: Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>03/20/2014: The project is consistent with the recipient country's national strategies, including 2003-2020 Biodiversity strategy and action plan (IBSAP) and the Master plan to reforest and rehabilitate degraded peatland. Cleared.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>03/20/2014: The project gives a good overview of the major trend and threat over freshwater ecosystems. Further details (including figures) on biodiversity health status of those ecosystems will be useful, especially on targeted sites. The description of stakeholders using freshwater ecosystems resources should be further developed (e.g. communities depending on this resource, % of inland fish exported).</p> <p>Finally, initial information on on-going initiatives are provided however, please give further details regarding initiatives led by NGOs and local governments; with an insight of the funding dedicated</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>to them.</p> <p>03/24/2014: It is noted that further consultation with stakeholders and local communities will be undertaken during PPG. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>03/20/2014: The expected outputs and outcomes have to revised and indicators developed. We fully understand the constraints, but the outcomes should desmonstrate the impact on biodiversity of global importance and the outputs the "tools" established to maintain/increase the health status of global biodiversity. For example, component 1/ outcome 1 could be as follow: in the targeted aquatic ecosystems, the Indonesian eels stock has increased by x%. The outputs would be: legal framework for inland aquatic resources extraction has been strengthened and incentive for enforcement developed.</p> <p>There is some discrepancies between Table B and the text, as detailed below:  Component1: The cross-sectoral dialogue on freshwater ecosystem management is a key tool of this project. Please include into Table B as an expected output and further detailed into the text how this dialogue will be set-up, developed.  Component 2:  The project scope is on inland fisheries, therefore please explain the rational to also develop activities on forestry, hydro-electric, and pollution (activities mentioned into the text but not into Table B). It is recommanded to maintain the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project approach: land based management with a focus on inland fisheries.</p> <p>Certification is the second key "tool" of this project. The activity is only mentioned into Table B, therefore please further explain what the activity will be into the text. The project expects to analyze the supply chain and develop guidelines for certification; it is recommended to be more ambitious. For example, we could expect that the pre-assessment or the first steps of the certification have started.</p> <p>P10. Please bear in mind that GEF projects support activities on fisheries with the objective to reduce/ alleviate all impact on biodiversity and to improve livelihoods.</p> <p>03/24/2014: The indicators, including baseline and target, will have to be further developed at CEO endorsement. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>03/20/2014:Indonesia has formally recognized the value of wetlands and the biodiversity they support. However, accurate information on the status and value of freshwater systems and their resources is lacking, current legal framework doesn't promote a integrative land based approach of these ecosystems. Based on-going national and local initiatives, the project will contribute to strengthening the legislation and develop relevant incentives for implementation and compliance of this new legislation on the field. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of:  a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>03/20/2014: As mentioned in Items 6 and 7, please further develop the current context and how the project will engage with local communities.</p> <p>03/24/2014: We understand that PPG will help to further consul with stakeholders on their roles and communities's activities. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>03/20/2014: Yes, the project takes into account the major risks and describe initial potential mitigation measures. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>03/20/2014: A first list of initiatives and how the project will build on them has been provided. however, please complete this list by the major on-going initiatives led by NGOs and local government. Please confirm that all FAO projects listed as-co financier, will not received any GEF funding. Finally, clearly describe how the project will complement and coordinate with the IFAD project submitted for GEF review on Sustainable management of wetland ecosystem in Indonesia.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		03/24/2014: it is noted that the proposal will further consult with coming new related projects for coordination, during PPG. Cleared at PIF stage.	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	03/20/2014: The project is designed as an example of cross-sectoral approach to conservation and sustainable use of inland aquatic biodiversity. The project will support government, local communities, and private sector to develop and implement coherent and sustainable management practice at freshwater ecosystem level. The success of this demonstration could be replicate and upscale in Indonesia.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	03/20/2014: The GEF funding and co-financing are appropriate. Cleared at PIF stage.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing	03/20/2014: The co-financing ratio is 1:5; which is fine. The Agency is bringing	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement:</u> Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>\$2.8million of co-financing. Please, for each co-financier, differentiate the amount provided in cash from the amount provided in-kind.  03/24/2014: Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?</p>	<p>03/20/2014: The PMC is 4.9% of the GEF grant; which is fine. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	<p>03/20/2014: A PPG is requested. The amount requested doesn't deviate from the norm. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>03/20/2014: N/A</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
Agency Responses	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b>	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	03/20/2014: The project cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address the above items.  03/24/2014: The project is technically cleared and recommended for inclusion into the next Work Program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	- Further developing SMART indicators, provide baseline and target - Implementation arrangements clarified - Comprehensive description of on-going related initiatives and coordination arrangements - Co-financing ratio maintain	
<b>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</b>	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	March 20, 2014	
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	Additional review (as necessary)	March 24, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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