GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9239**		
Country/Region:	**Indonesia**		
Project Title:	**Integrated Management of Peatland Landscapes in Indonesia (IMPLI)**		
GEF Agency:	**IFAD**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-1 Program 1; BD-4 Program 9; LD-3 Program 4; CCM-2 Program 4; SFM-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$4,895,872**
Co-financing:	**$20,700,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$25,595,872**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Ulrich Apel**	Agency Contact Person:	**Roshan Cooke**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	The project is identified to align with BD1-1, BD4-9, LD3-4, and CCM2-4, and SFM. In order to align with BD1-1, the relevant component and activities need to be further strengthened and redesigned. Please also identify relevant Aichi target that this project will contribute to.	

[1] 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Relevant SFM objective and program also needs to be identified. 20 Sept 2015 Adequate information and revision made.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Not sufficient. Please provide clear information on how this project align with the national strategies related to CBD, UNFCCC, and UNCCD. Please identify relevant objective/section of these documents related to the project initiative. The information currently provided is insufficient to recognise the linkages. 20 Sept 2015 Yes, adequate information provided.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Drivers: Adequate Sustainability: No. Initiatives to ensure institutional and financial sustainability are unclear. Particularly, considering that this is a third phase investment, financial sustainability needs to be clearly built in to the project. Please clarify and incorporate relevant outcome, output, activities in the project framework. Scaling and Innovation: Despite the fact that this project is a third-phase	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		of GEF investment on peatlands, relevant initiatives to upscale the work at the national level (beyond specific landscape) is weak. Please review and strengthen institutional, legislative, and financing frameworks of the initiative to ensure upscaling and sustainability. 20 Sept 2015 - While adequate information has been provided under section 1.6, these elements need to be clearly incorporated in the project framework as key outcome and/or output. - The country has been challenged in combing public, private, and community actions for avoiding further peatland degradation and enhancing restoration efforts for years. Please provide further details on how the project would do differently to address the issues, and ensure sustainability and scaling up. Please revise the project framework and the project design sections accordingly.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	No. Besides the development of the national regulations on peatland management, it is unclear what are the baseline activities that the government and other partners are	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		implementating and the gaps. Moreover, it is not at all clear what the EU and German cofinancing projects are planned to implement, and what the GEF will be financing under this project. Further, it is not clear how these different projects will be coordinated and managed. Please provide adequate information to justify incremental financing from the GEF. To note, GEF usually provides finance to similar/phased project only after the successful completion of the previous-phase project, and when subsequent phase is clearly justified. This GEF-6 financing request for this peatland management came in before the related GEF-5 project is CEO endorsed and implemented. The PIF argues that the GEF-5 project initiates site based initiative, while the GEF-6 project will upscale it at the national level. Without the GEF-5 project results and evidence, what is the knowledge base to upscale the initiative? Please provide detail information and analysis on how the two projects complements, and clarify the difference in scope and initiatives to avoid overlaps. Please also clarify how the two projects are planned to	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		be integrated and implemented in a harmonized manner, including implementation arrangement and modalities. Further, please provide further details on how this project and the Global Commodity IAP child project in the country will complement and coordinate the initiatives. 20 Sept 2015 Additional information has been provided but not sufficient. Please clarify further: - Linkage of the project with REDD+ - The first 3 risks identified are significant and potentially high. Please provide additional details on how the project will be addressing these risks.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Without clear information on the baseline and cofinancing initiatives, it is hard to examine whether the suggested project framework is appropriate or not. Please provide the necessary information noted under section 4. On the GEBs, please provide specific and tangible information on the global biodiversity benefits, including species and ecosystem services. The current information is too general and	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		vague. Please also provide specific information on the sustainable land management benefits. On component 2: 1) please clarify the baseline of the GHG emission and how much does 20% reduction means in metric tons. Please also clarify how much would "15% increase in area of certified sustainable production area" be, and what kind of certification system/method will be used. 2) What kind of capacity development initiatives would the project do to enhance management effectiveness of the biosphere reserve? Needs further information and clarification. On component 3, what are the scope of work related to developing incentives and markets for products linked to sustainable use of peatlands? Please provide further information on the project's private sector engagement. What would be the incentive and their expected roles? As noted also under section 3, how would the project ensure institutional and financial sustainability and long term engagement on peatland management? After three phases of	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		GEF investment on the issue, this is a very important issue that requires clear strategy and relevant actions incorporated in the project design. 20 Sept 2015 Additional information has been provided but further clarifications are required on the following elements: 1) GEB: The GEBs derived from Giam Siak Kecil Peatland landscape is clear, however it is unclear where the rest of the GEBs come from. Component 3 indicates "targeted areas" but it is not specified. Please provide necessary information. 2) Institutional and financial sustainability - as noted above, please clearly incorporate these elements in the project framework as key outcome or output of the project. The GEF can not continue to provide additional resources to each peatland landscapes in Indonesia, and this should be a key outcome/output of this project to ensure sustainability and upscaling under the national capacities.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Gender - considering strong relevance, please clarify and ensure gender analysis will be included as part of the socio-economic assessment at the PPG stage, and	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		gender responsive results framework will be developed by the time of CEO endorsement. Please also provide appropriate information based on country situation rather than cut and pasting same information for all related projects. IPs - Please clarify that the appropriate IPs Plan will developed through a FPIC process. 20 Sept 2015 Adequate information provided on gender and IP elements. We also want to make sure the roles of the private sector players to be described more fully, particularly considering that they play a major role within and around the PA. Please clarify their roles, and the planned interaction/relationship with the public and community activities. Likewise, there are also many CSO groups that are active in the area but not clearly described in the PIF. Please make sure CSOs involved in social and environmental issues are consulted and participating in the project.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	BD, CCM, LD resources are within	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the GEF-6 allocation. SFM incentive ratio is less than 1 to 2 and adequate. On table B, the GEF amount does not add up to the grand total as noted. Please review and revise. 20 Sept 2015 Adequate revision made. On the cofinance, it is recognized that all government cofinancing is in-kind. Considering substantial baseline activities that are supported by the government and potential synergy under this project, please review and increase grant cofinancing.	
	• The focal area allocation?	Refer above.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Focal area set-aside?	11/14/2016 UA: Please note that the requested SFM incentive funding cannot be guaranteed as the SFM program is oversubscribed. The availability of SFM resources will be re-checked at the time of Work Program Inclusion.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	No, please review the comments carefully and review the scope of the project. The PIF requires substantial revision.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		20 Sept 2015 No. Additional information has been provided and revision has been made, however, further clarification/revision are required as noted above. Please revise and resubmit the PIF. 26 Aug 2016 The GEFSEC received a revised PIF that adequately responds to most of the earlier comments. Please kindly clarify the following issues related to global environment benefits and resubmit a revised PIF: 1) Project target for improved management of peatland landscapes: table F (1.2m ha) and table in page 14 (800k ha) does not match. Please revise and ensure consistency. 2) GHG emission reduction: Table B, table F, and PIF text does not match. Is it 1.85m or 3.839 million tCO2e? Please clarify, and also provide information on how the figure has been derived by using Ex-ACT or other relevant tools. 23 Sept 2016 The GEFSEC received a revised PIF that further clarifies the GEBs, however, the concerned FA PMs have the following questions for further	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		clarification. Once these comments are addressed and incorporated in the PIF, the PIF will be recommended by CEO clearance. a. The estimate for the GHG benefits is reasonable according to the figures indicated in the proposal. Nevertheless, further clarification is required on: 1) the references of the used emission factors; and 2) the information to justify the assumptions in table p.16 regarding the expected areas of fire prevention, improved water management and avoided forest conversion. The practices implemented in component 2 are vague and it is not clear how they allow to achieve the results for the announced areas. b. In line with the GEF-6 strategy on biodiversity focal area, investment under the BD focal area needs to be focused on Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) as determined under IUCN standards. Please kindly clarify that the identified landscape are identified as KBAs, and at least one outcome related to biodiversity conservation is identified under component 2. 01/25/2017 UA: All clarification requests were	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		addressed in the re-submission of Oct 4, 2016. Program Managers recommends CEO clearance.	
Review Date	Review	August 10, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 20, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 26, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		