



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

|  |   |                              |                 |
|--|---|------------------------------|-----------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | 4933  |                              |                 |
| Country/Region:                            | Indonesia   |                              |                 |
| Project Title:                             | Third National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |                              |                 |
| GEF Agency:                                | UNDP  | GEF Agency Project ID:       | 5019 (UNDP)     |
| Type of Trust Fund:                        | GEF Trust Fund  | GEF Focal Area (s):          | Climate Change  |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | CCM-6; Project Mana;  |                              |                 |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | \$0   | Project Grant:               | \$4,500,000     |
| Co-financing:                              | \$21,000,000  | Total Project Cost:          | \$25,500,000    |
| PIF Approval:                              |   | Council Approval/Expected:   |                 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |   | Expected Project Start Date: |                 |
| Program Manager:                           | Rawleston Moore   | Agency Contact Person:       | Butchaiah Gadde |

| 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?  | Indonesia is eligible to receive resources. Indonesia submitted its second national communications the 19th January 2012.   |  |
|                                | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?   | The operational focal point has endorsed the project. A letter is on file.  |  |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?                     | The comparative advantage for this project is clearly described. UNDP has a comparative advantage for this type of project. |  |
|                                | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?                | N/A   |  |
|                                | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?                           | Yes, the project fits into the Agency's capacity in the country.  |  |
|                                | 6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): |   |  |

|                       |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Resource Availability |  |  |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>   | The resources are available from the STAR allocation of Indonesia  |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>   |  |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>   |  |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>  |  |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>  |  |  |
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>  |  |  |
| Project Consistency   | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?  | The project is aligned with GEF CCM results framework. The project once successfully implemented will assist Indonesia to prepare its third national communications, and submit a biennial update report, to the UNFCCC.                     |  |
|                       | 8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?  | The relevant GEF 5 focal area objective, CCM -6 support enabling activities and capacity building are identified.  |  |
|                       | 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? | The third national communications is a Convention obligation. Its consistent with the Indonesia Climate Change Sectoral Roadmap.   |  |
|                       | 10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?  | The third national communications project will provide the relevant information to serve as an input for the preparation of mitigation projects, as well as enhance the implementation of various Presidential Decree's on greenhouse gases. |  |
|                       | 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?        | The project responds to a requirement which countries have, to prepare national communications to the UNFCCC. The project will build in  |  |

|                |   |   |  |
|----------------|---|---|--|
| Project Design |   | greenhouse gas inventories for the years 2000-2010. The project will provide an assessment of the impacts, vulnerability and adaptation policies, and measures to address climate change, variability and extreme events. The project will also provide an improved understanding of GHG emission based scenarios in Indonesia and complete a biennial update report. |  |
|                | 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?   | The project will assist in preparing the national communications for Indonesia and thus it is not necessary to demonstrate additional reasoning.  |  |
|                | 14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?  | The project framework is sufficiently clear. Please add a bullet on information on domestic measurement and verification in Table B-Project Framework, Section E.   |  |
|                | 15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?   | The applied methodology for this project is appropriate.  |  |
|                | 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? | There is a clear description of the socio-economic benefits. The third national communications will address gender concerns by recommending the building of adaptation capacities of women to cope with the adverse impacts of climate change and reduce negative effects on household welfare and environmental sustainability.                                      |  |
|                | 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken  | By CEO Endorsement further information should be provided on the  |  |

|                   |   |   |  |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
|                   | identified and addressed properly?  |   |  |
|                   | 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) | The risk associated with this project is considered as low. Incorporation of all of the relevant stakeholders is seen as the best measure to ensure success of the project. By CEO endorsement further information should be provided on potential risks and mitigation measures. |  |
|                   | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?  | A project steering committee will be put in place to ensure that the project is coordinated with other related initiatives.   |  |
|                   | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?  | The project will be executed by the Ministry of Environment. Further details on the implementation and execution requirements should be presented 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 | 23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?   | The project management costs are 5.2% of the total project costs. This level is appropriate.  |  |
|                   | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?  | The funding and co-financing is adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs.  |  |
|                   | 25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;   | The co-finance is appropriate.  |  |

|   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
|   | confirmed co-financing is provided.   |   |  |
|   | 26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?                            | The co-finance amount that the agency is bringing to the project is in line with its role.  |  |
| 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 and targets?           |   |  |
| 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                 | <b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>   | The PIF is recommended for clearance.   |  |
|   | 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.  | By CEO Endorsement further details on the implementation and execution requirements should be presented, along with information on potential risks and mitigation measures and the participation of CSOs and NGOs. The projected dates for submission of the third national communications and biennial update report should be identified. |  |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? |   |  |
|   | <b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>   |   |  |
| Review Date (s)                             | First review*   | April 04, 2012  |  |

|  |                                  |  |  |
|--|----------------------------------|--|--|
|  | Additional review (as necessary) |  |  |
|  | Additional review (as necessary) |  |  |
|  | Additional review (as necessary) |  |  |

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

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

| Review Criteria            | Decision Points   | Program Manager Comments  |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| PPG Budget                 | 1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate? | Activities 3, 4 and 5 are appropriate activities, however further clarification is required for activities 1 and 2, and the proposed outputs 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 |
|                            | 2. Is itemized budget justified?                                    | The budget is currently not justified. Clarification is needed on the costs of components 1 and 2 and the associated outputs 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1.                |
| Secretariat Recommendation | 3. Is PPG approval being recommended?                               | The PPG is currently not being recommended for approval.  |
|                            | 4. Other comments   |   |
| Review Date (s)            | First review*   | April 04, 2012  |
|                            | 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.