



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

GEF ID:	6965		
Country/Region:	Indonesia		
Project Title:	Strengthening Forest Area Planning and Management in Kalimantan		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5029 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$195,000	Project Grant:	\$9,000,000
Co-financing:	\$55,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$64,195,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Midori Paxton

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Yes	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	GEF6 STAR: BD \$5,000,000 LD: \$1,000,000 Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	OK	
	• the LDCF under the principle of	NA	

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

¹ 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 ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	SFM: \$3,000,000	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</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>BD4, programme 9 LD3, Programme 4 SFM1</p> <p>Aichi Targets: strategic goal B (Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target 5: the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced; - Target 7: areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity; - Target 15: ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced. <p>Indicators are embedded in the project outcome statement in Table B, and clear target and baseline will be developed during the PPG.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE,</p>	<p>IBSAP 2003-2020 National and Local Mitigation Plan Forestry Planning.</p> <p>Please explain how the project is</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	compatible with the NAP (UNCCD).	
Project Design	6. 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 problems and the barriers the project wants to overcome are well described. Cleared.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	To be determined later. See cell 12, the project will have to be revised to be fully aligned with the Commodity IAP that is under development and UNDP's lead.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes, the GEB are well identified: 1.9 million ha of intact forests, avoided emission of 269 million tC, better sustainable and integrated forest landscape management in three sites (100,000 ha) in Kalimantan with better Biodiversity Health Index, X ha of productive landscapes on degraded lands, sustainable financing mechanisms, etc. At CEO endorsement, please detail the monitoring system, the baseline and the indicators.	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their	An impressive list of stakeholders and partners, including the private sector, CSO and the national alliance of indigenous people is provided. At CEO	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	engagement explained?	endorsement, please detail the coordination mechanisms.	
	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)	Yes. During the PPG, include a comprehensive risk analysis. Cleared.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	No. The project mentions other on-going GEF projects. However, given the strategic importance of the Commodities IAP, which is currently under development under UNDP's lead, it is essential that this project proposal is fully aligned with the IAP in order to maximize potential of both initiatives. The project will have to demonstrate that it is aligned with the IAP and how it supports the strategic approach.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's 	Innovation: Following the previous comment (cell 12), it is difficult to support a new pilot and demonstration project on forest planning and management, without knowing how this project will be innovative and will be complementary with the Commodity IAP. Sustainability: During the PPG, please develop the sustainability aspects of the financing mechanisms and the way that resources from other projects/initiatives will be channeled.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	intervention.		
	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?	<p>To be determined.</p> <p>The resources for this project stay relatively low (\$9 million) in regards to the challenges that are faced in Kalimantan. It is essential to well coordinate this project with the Commodity IAP. Please, justify how these resources will be complementary of those used within the IAP.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement, see if cofinancing can be increased for the third component. We understand that resources from other projects/initiatives should be channeled using the mechanisms developed under this project.</p>	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing 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?	Cofinancing is coming from the government (\$50m) and UNDP (\$5m). Confirm at CEO endorsement.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Just under five percent.	
	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?	A \$195,000 PPG is requested for this \$9 million project. The amount is in the norm. Cleared.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	The project cannot be recommended yet. Please address the comments above, mainly related to the alignment of this current proposal with the Commodity Integrated Pilot Approach.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 26, 2014	
Review Date (s)	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.**