



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

GEF ID:	4892		
Country/Region:	Indonesia		
Project Title:	Transforming Effectiveness of Biodiversity Conservation in Priority Sumatran Landscapes		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	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-1; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$9,000,000
Co-financing:	\$52,681,636	Total Project Cost:	\$61,681,636
PIF Approval:	April 17, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Jiang Ru

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible? 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	03/23/2012: Yes 03/23/2012: Yes, in a letter dated March, 19, 2012. However, please send a updated letter clarifying if the total financing requested from the GEFTF for this project is US\$9,000,000 (including PPG, and agency fees) as presented in the narrative part of the letter or US\$10,000,000; as presented in the table of the letter. The fees amount in the table will have be to updated too. Furthermore, the budget into the PIF will have to be consistent with the amount requested in the OFP letter. 04/05: The WB provided the following information: "Previously, there was a discrepancy between the first PIF submitted and the GEF Focal Point's	

		<p>allocation for this project is expected to be \$10 million (including fees) as verbally communicated by the Focal Point and we are currently seeking a revised letter of support". However, a letter of endorsement with consistency in the numbers is needed for the approval process.</p> <p>4/13/2012: Addressed. The OFP endorsed the project in a letter dated April, 9, 2012 for \$10,000,000 inclusive of PPG, Agency fees.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	03/23/2012: Yes.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	03/23/2012: N/A	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	03/23/2012: The project fits well under the Country Partnership Strategy and the Global Tiger Initiative, in improving the management effectiveness of natural resources. The staff capacity and expertise in the country office are adequate.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	<p>03/23/2012: yes, however there is some discrepancies between the OFP letter and PIF proposed budget, therefore, please clarify and update accordingly.</p> <p>04/05/2012: Thank for the update, however, please make sure it will be coherent with the OFP updated letter</p>	

		04/13/2012: The PIF is consistent with the amounts stated in the OFP updated letter. Cleared.	
	• the focal area allocation?	03/23/2012: N/A	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	03/23/2012: N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	03/23/2012: N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	03/23/2012: N/A	
	• focal area set-aside?	03/23/2012: N/A	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	03/23/2012: The project is well aligned with the BD result framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	03/23/2012: Yes, the project will contribute to the objectives BD-1 and BD-2 of the GEF-5.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	03/23/2012: Yes, the project is consistent with the Policy on Wildlife. Please, confirm the alignment of the project with Sumatra Vision 2020. 04/05/2012: Addressed.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	03/23/2012: Initial information is provided however, please give more details on the type of capacities developed and the targeted actors (including figures). 04/05/2012: Addressed.	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	03/23/2012: Preliminary information has been provided, however, please give a main summary of elements on past and on-going activities in the area targeted, including an insight of the funding amount, and indicate clearly where the gaps are. Furthermore, in order to strengthen the	

Project Design		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the threats - the role of the provincial government in the project <p>04/05/2012: Information has been provided. However, please give an insight of the baseline funding amount in the area targeted.</p> <p>04/13/2012: The baseline funding is approximately \$28 million. Addressed.</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>03/23/2012: Please, explain clearly how the baseline gaps will be filled leading to the justification of the components, which need to have an integrated approach. As they stand, they present a piecemeal approach. Please, justify also the sites selected and the nature of the activities.</p> <p>04/05/2012: Addressed.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>03/23/2012: With regards to the allocated budget, it is expected to have a focus on districts/government to develop and implement a pilot inter-sectoral governance system. Clear expected targets on biodiversity conservation status will have to be defined for the outcomes.</p> <p>Concerning component 1 and 3, the project should implement a financing plan in at least one PA. Please, further explain how can activities of component</p>	

		<p>With regards to component 2, please explicitly detail the activities related to the innovative forest/biodiversity projects and the essential activities leading to the scale-up of REDD+ schemes.</p> <p>04/05/2012: Addressed at PIF stage.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>03/23/2012: yes, however with regards to the WB expertise and the multiplicity of pilot projects in Sumatra, please confirm that the SMART-based patrolling is a method approved at national level and implemented in other areas and please describe on which previous and on-going experiences in the region the financing mechanism proposal will built.</p> <p>04/05/2012: Addressed.</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>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>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>03/23/2012: Please futher detail this item, notably with regards to the activities developed under component 2 with local communities and authorities.</p> <p>04/05/2012: Addressed.</p>	

	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	03/23/2012: The key risks are identified and adequate mitigations are proposed at PIF stage.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	03/23/2012: Information is provided on some related initiatives, however, please give a better overview of the on-going and future initiatives and how the project will coordinate with, among others, the CEPF, the Tropical Forest Conseration Action, the Sumatran Tiger Trust, the WWF Indonesia programs and, the future GEF Project aiming to enhance PA system in Sulawesi (E-PASS). 04/05/2012: Addressed.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	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. 04/13/2012: Preliminary information has been included to the document. However, further explanation on how the local communities and local authorities are involved/represented will be requested at CEO endorsement.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		

Project Financing	management cost appropriate?	<p>the project management cost is about 4.7%, which is appropriate.</p> <p>04/13/2012: The GEF funding level for the project management cost is about 4.81%, which is still appropriate.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>03/23/2012: The funding for the expected outputs of the 3 components seems excessive, therefore, please reduce or better justify these allocations. Furthermore, please provide the budget breakdown by expected outcomes.</p> <p>04/05/2012: Thank for the information. However, justification is still lacking. Therefore, as requested in item 11, please provide an insight of the baseline funding.</p> <p>04/13/2012: Addressed.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>03/23/2012: The indicative co-financing ratio is 1:4.45. Please, clarify if possible, the type of Ministry co-financing.</p> <p>04/05/2012: The indicative co-financing ratio is now about 1:5.79. Following your comment, please update Table C accordingly.</p> <p>04/11/2012: The indicative co-financing ratio is now about 1:5.85. Addressed.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	03/23/2012: The WB will contribute at a level of US\$500,000, in grant.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators		

Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>03/23/2012: The PIF can not be recommended at this stage, please address the mentioned issues.</p> <p>04/05/2012: Please, address the remaining issues raised in the review sheet. The PIF will not be recommended for CEO approval without the updated OFP letter clarifying the total financing requested from the GEF TF.</p> <p>04/13/2012: Yes, the PIF is being recommended for clearance.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>03/23/2012: Please, ensure that the following issues are addressed at the Request for CEO Endorsement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear and measurable outputs and outcomes are defined - Co-financing is confirmed - Implementation arrangements with partners and local authorities are well set-up - CSOs and private sector are well involved in the project implementation - A full risk analysis - GEF TT are included - Strong evidence of Global Environmental Benefits and GEF incremental value are presented 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of		

	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 23, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 05, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 13, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

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

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