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| **Project title: C**atalyzing **O**ptimum Management of **N**atural Heritage for **S**ustainability of **E**cosystem, **R**esources and **V**iability of **E**ndangered Wildlife Species (CONSERVE) |
| **Country:** Indonesia | **Implementing Partner (GEF Executing Entity):**  Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF/KLHK) | **Execution Modality***:* National Implementation Modality |
| **Contributing Outcome (UNDDF/CPD, RPD, GPD)***:* Outcome 3 (UNCPD 2021-2025): By 2025, Institutions, communities and people actively apply and implement low carbon development, sustainable natural resources management, and disaster resilience approaches that are all gender sensitive.**CPD Output 3.2**: Strengthened and expanded protection, governance and management of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, habitats and species (Strategic Plan output1.4.1) |
| **UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Category:** High Risk | **UNDP Gender Marker:** 2 |
| **Atlas Award ID: 00126223** | **Atlas Project/Output ID: 00120339** |
| **UNDP-GEF PIMS ID number:** 6380 | **GEF Project ID number:** 10236 |
| **LPAC meeting date:** 5 August 2021 |
| **Latest possible date to submit to GEF:** 15 June 2020 |
| **Latest possible CEO endorsement date:** 11 June 2021 |
| **Project duration in months: 72 months** |
| **Planned start date:** February 2022 | **Planned end date:** Operational close: February 2028 |
| **Expected date of posting of Mid-Term Review to ERC:** February 2025 | **Expected date of posting Terminal evaluation report to ERC:** August 2027 |
| **Brief project description:** The loss of biological diversity is one of the most severe human-caused global environmental problems. Wildlife is critical to ecosystem functioning and their decline and extinction disrupts natural processes and services. Rapid population growth in rural areas leads to increased habitat loss and increased human wildlife conflicts over scarce resources. This is a serious challenge that can lead to retaliatory killing, negative perspectives of communities towards wildlife, and undermine support for conservation.There is failure to account for economic and ecological biodiversity value that leads to mismanagement and overexploitation. Local populations that live with wildlife are often excluded from benefits derived from the value of wildlife, which in many cases is extracted unsustainably by few. Wildlife is also under threat as they are often not considered a preferred land-use choice to generate benefits for governments and local communities through nature-based tourism or other economically viable activities.The project is designed to strengthen management of multiple use landscapes to enhance biodiversity conservation, generate sustainable land-use and livelihood practices and address illegal wildlife trade. The project’s intervention is to ensure that existing protected areas and surrounding high conservation value forests are managed to support viable populations of globally threatened species and allows for the movement of wildlife, pollination and reproduction, and other processes that support the recovery and improve natural resiliency to external development including climatic shocks. This will be achieved through the implementation of four inter-related components that are focussed at addressing existing barriers. The four components of the project are: |
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| --- |
| **This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):** **SDG Target 15: Life on Land (Sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, halt and reverse land degradation, halt biodiversity loss**1. Target 15.1: By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements
2. Target 15.5: Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species
3. Target 15.7: Take urgent action to end poaching and trafficking of protected species of flora and fauna and address both demand and supply of illegal wildlife products
4. Target 15.9: By 2020, integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts

5. Target 15.c: Enhance global support for efforts to combat poaching and trafficking of protected species, including by increasing the capacity of local communities to pursue sustainable livelihood opportunities**SDG Target 1: End Poverty in all its form everywhere:****Target 1.1.** By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance |
| **This project will contribute to the following country outcome (UNDAF/CPD, RPD, GPD):** Outcome 3 (UNCPD 2021-2025): By 2025, Institutions, communities and people actively apply and implement low carbon development, sustainable natural resources management, and disaster resilience approaches that are all gender sensitive.CPD Output 3.2: Strengthened and expanded protection, governance and management of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, habitats and species (Strategic Plan output1.4.1) |

|  | **Objective and Outcome Indicators** | **Baseline**  | **Mid-term Target** | **End of Project Target** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Objective:***Strengthen management of multiple use landscapes to enhance biodiversity conservation, generate sustainable land-use and livelihood practices and address illegal wildlife trade* | ***Indicator 1*** *(GEF Core Indicator 4):* *Area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding Protected areas) to benefit biodiversity.* *This is measured by the development and operational of new OECMs under existing KEE guidelines with integrated multi-stakeholders’ programs and budgeting as defined by:**(i) promulgation of decree for establishment of OECMs through under existing Essential Ecosystem Areas (KEEs) guidelines;* *(ii) formalization of multi-stakeholder forum for decision-making on OECMs;**(iii) Approval of strategy and plan for OECMs;* *(iv) Provincial government financing for OECM plan;* *(v) Commitment of provincial government for continuation of FMU mechanism for production forests within OECMs;* *(vi) Strengthened BKSDA and provincial Forest Units with staff and equipment for KEE plan implementation;* *(vii) Private sector commitment and financing for OECM plan forest restoration and protection;* *(viii) Village Fund focused on OECM compatible actions; and**(ix) monitoring system operational to monitor OECM effectiveness, etc.* *Source of baseline:*1. *Analisis kesenjangan keterwakilan ekologis Kawasan Konservasi di Indonesia, 2010. Ditjen PHKA. Kemenhut.*
2. *LKJ Dit. BPEE tahun 2020.*
3. [*https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/may/26/sumatra-borneo-deforestation-tigers-palm-oil*](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/may/26/sumatra-borneo-deforestation-tigers-palm-oil)
 | *Around 70% of remaining HCV forests under threat of further fragmentation, particularly in Sumatra due to oil palm cultivation (this figure will be validated for each site in Year 1)**Around 29.091 hectares Elephant Corridor in the Landscape Seblat* *Meanwhile, of the six ecoregions in Sumatra, some are still in good condition based on**the amount that is included in the classification of essential ecosystems. Sumatran tropical pine forest and Sumatran montane rain forest has the largest area of essential ecosystems, sized 76.87% and 63.76%. While the smallest ecoregion area in an essential ecosystem is the Sumatran freshwater swamp forest with only the size 8.80%.**Essential ecosystems in Sumatra reach around 12.8 million hectares or 30.37% of the total area of Sumatra. Only 26.18% of this area is represented in the conservation area, while the rest is divided into areas: protection forest (25.32%), production forest (19.11%), and limited production forest (16.47%).*  | *Biological landscape integrated frameworks agreed among all stakeholders, for achieving long-term conservation outcomes corridors and at least* ***150,000*** *hectares under improved management* | *At least* ***740,000 hectares*** *(excluding protected areas covered under Indicator 2)* *of biological landscapes under improved management through establishment and improved management of Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs) through existing KEE mechanism*Targeted area with high biodiversity inventoried and verified by UPT KSDAE until 2025:* + - 1. Aceh 333,203 Ha (708,389.7 Ha total area biodiversity scoring analysis)
			2. Bengkulu and Lampung 294,180 Ha (583,940,38 Ha)
			3. There is no target for Moyo.

 |
| ***Indicator 2*** *(GEF Core Indicator 1.2): Protected Areas under improved management and sustainable use covering 81,845 hectares* | *Baseline METT scores (in point):**Jantho Nature Reserve - 33**Jantho Nature Recreation Park - 36**Seblat Nature Recreation park – 36**Moyo Nature Recreation Park– 35**Moyo Hunting Park - 27* | *Increased of average of 5 points from existing baselines* | *Increased of average of 15-20 points from existing baselines* |
| ***Indicator 3*** *(GEF Core Indicator 11): Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefits of GEF investment* | *Actual number of individuals participating in co-benefits will be validated in Year 1*  | *At least 1,000 individuals are directly benefiting from sustainable natural resources management, sustainable use of wildlife resources and improved and alternative livelihoods and incomes (at least 300 women beneficiaries of which at least 100 are women from custodian communities)* | *At least 4,500 individuals, directly benefit through sustainable natural resource management, sustainable use of wildlife resources and livelihood improvement approaches (at least 1,350 women beneficiaries, of which at 450 are women from custodian communities)* |
| ***Component 1: Strengthened management and protection of multiple use landscapes for the conservation of key threatened species*** |
| **Outcome 1**Effective policy, coordination, regulatory and institutional framework for planning, management, compliance monitoring, enforcement and decision making for integrated management of biological landscapes developed and implemented | ***Indicator 4****: Number of actions from existing key species strategies and action plans (elephant, tiger, and yellow crested Cockatoo) agreed with stakeholders and applied within pilot sites* | *Key threatened species strategies and emergency action plans under finalization* | *Action plans formally approved and key species actions integrated into KEE management plans and budgetary provisions made through the project and provincial budgets for their effective implementation* | *At least 3 key action plans for each threatened species for tiger, elephant and yellow crested Cockatoo implemented within project sites, monitored for their effectiveness and included in provincial budgets for their continued implementation beyond the project period.* |
| ***Indicator 5****: Number of policy instruments that are in place and applied to integrate biodiversity outcomes in sector and national and local planning policy and programs* | *Current policies need to better address impacts on broader ecological principles and processes for the survival of species, maintenance of ecological services, and habitat connectivity.* | *Policies reviewed, gap assessed and draft policy instruments under review* | *At least five instruments (update/creation of provincial decrees for establishment of KEEs; establishment of KEE Forums; KEE management body in place, establishment of budgetary norms/procedures for financing KEE actions, FMU guidelines, Village Fund use procedures, etc.) for improving biodiversity outcomes within the biological landscapes developed and adopted* |
| ***Indicator 6****: Level of institutional capacities for planning, implementation and monitoring integrated biodiversity management planning in OECMs as measured by UNDP’s capacity development scorecard for the following institutions:** 1. *Directorate of Biodiversity Conservation of Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KSDAE)*
	2. *Provincial BKSDA of Bengkulu*
	3. *Provincial BKSDA of Aceh*
	4. *Provincial BKSDA of West Nusa Tenggara*
 | *Limited institutional capacities for planning, implementation and monitoring of multiple use OECM planning and management in biological landscapes as measured by UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard baseline values as indicated below:**KSDAE/MOEF-29**BKSDA Bengkulu: 12**BKSDA Aceh: 12**BKSDA West Nusa Tenggara 10* | *Average increase of institutional capacity as measured by a 5 point increase in UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard baseline values for the 3 OECMs* | *Average increase of institutional capacity as measured by 15 points in UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard from baseline values for the three OECMs* |
|  | ***Indicator 7:*** *Population density of key species in the target landscapes** 1. *Sumatran tiger*
	2. *Sumatran elephant*
	3. *Yellow-crested cockatoo*

*[Baselines sources are FFI tiger team, FFI 2019 (unpublished data) for Ulu Masen and Seblat; and Source for Moyo island is BKSDA (**Naïve occupancy estimate is the proportion of the area occupied by a particular species during the transect surveys. These figures are currently being converted to density estimates that would be available by the launch workshop}* | *Key species under continued threat from forest loss, degradation, loss of connectivity and poaching. Baselines are:**Seblat* * *Sumatran Tiger: Naïve occupancy estimate 0.88/100km2*
* *Sumatran Elephant: naive occupancy estimate 0.1/100km2*

*Aceh:* * *Sumatran Tiger: naive occupancy estimate 0.80/100km2*
* *Sumatran Elephant: naive occupancy estimate 0.69/100km2*

*Moyo**Yellow crested cockatoo: 0.27 individuals/km2* | *Density of key species populations validated and monitoring protocols established* | *Key species population densities stable or increasing from baseline values* |
|  | ***Indicator 8:*** *Number of HWC cases reported and responded by authorities and communities** + *Human-tiger conflict*
	+ *Human-elephant conflict*
	+ *Crop damage and livestock depredation*
 | *HWC based on:*  *ii) Number of HWC conflicts reported**Ulu Masen. E: 56, T: 7**Seblat: E:3 T:6* *Moyo: no conflict**(ii) Number of reports of destruction of agricultural crops, and/or cattle losses**Ulu Masen E: 45, T: 5**Seblat: E:0, T:2* *Moyo no conflict**Baseline data on frequency above will be validated in Year 1* | *At least 30% decrease in human-wildlife conflict reported based on HWC responded* *At least 50% reduction of agricultural crop and cattle loss reported based on HWC* | *At least 50% decrease in human-wildlife conflict reported and reduction of agricultural crops and cattle loss reported due to HWC* |
| **Outputs to achieve Outcome 1** | ***Output 1.1: Key species strategies and action plans implemented with adequate investments in new tools and equipment******Output 1.2: Improved policies,*** *regulations, guidelines and planning frameworks for development of integrated management of biological landscapes and integrating biodiversity into key development strategies of public and private sectors developed and adopted****Output 1.3:*** *Planning for the application of OECM approaches, including creation of management body for overseeing law enforcement, improve key threatened species and habitat management and monitoring, and support biodiversity-friendly enterprises in the project landscapes* ***Output 1.4:*** *Measures for management and control of human-wildlife conflict and anti-poaching developed and implemented with incentive mechanisms for forest-fringe communities*  |
| **Component 2. Enhanced site-based enforcement and monitoring of sustainable use of wildlife resources** |
| **Outcome 2**Improved site-based enforcement and monitoring of wildlife resources through enhancement and deployment of state-of-the-art technologies and traditional wisdom | ***Indicator 9:*** *Reduction in threats at target sites as measured by the increase of foot patrol distances (kilometers) and decrease in illegal activity (as measured by traps encountered, people apprehended, etc.)*  | *Total number of current SMART-RBM patrols in 3 sites as follows:**Ulu Masen – 18.29 kilometers/month (1 patrol twice a month)**Seblat: 36.58 kilometers/month (2 patrols/ twice a month)**Moya: 9.14 kilometers/ month (1 patrol/once a months)* *Baseline based on average distances covered by single patrol teams/month from Gurung Leuser NP (2016-2019) that will be validated in Year 1 for each of the 3 sites.* *Baselines in terms of average number of annual recorded illegal activities (poaching, IWT, etc.) will be assessed in Year 1* | *Number of SMART-RBM patrols*  *Ulu Masen – 54.87 kilometers/month (3 patrols/twice a month)**Seblat: 54.87 kilometers/ month (3 patrols/twice a month)**Moya: 18.28 kilometers/ month (1 patrol/twice a month)**30% average decrease in illegal activities detected from baseline*  | *Number of SMART-RBM patrols*  *Ulu Masen – 109.74 kilometers/month (6 patrols/twice a month)* *Seblat: 73.12 kilometers/month (4 patrols/twice a month)**Moya: 36.56 kilometers/month (2 patrols/twice a month)**80% average decrease in illegal activities detected from baseline*  |
| ***Indicator 10****: frequency and effectiveness of community patrols to reduce threats from poaching and illegal activities*  | *Ulu Masen – 212 patrols days/year**Seblat – 168 patrol days/year**Moyo – 60 patrol days/year**Baseline in terms of frequency of patrols available from Ulu Masen (FFI data 2019), Seblat (BKSDA-Bengkulu), and Moyo (BKSDA-NTB).* | *Increased frequency of Community patrols/year**Ulu Masen – 275 patrol days/year**Seblat – 218 patrol days/year**Moyo –78 patrol days/year* | *Increased frequency of Community patrols/year**Ulu Masen – 424 patrol days/year**Seblat – 251 patrol days/year**Moyo – 96 patrol days/year* |
| ***Indicator 11****: Number of IWT crime investigations conducted using DNA analysis through enhanced site-based genetics technology accredited in project provinces*  | *No capacity at provincial level to support DNA-based investigation related to IWT**Currently only a single national DNA-based data analysis institute in the country has ability to DNA-based investigation**.* | *The capacity ta provincial level to support DNA-based investigation related to IWT established* *Aceh Province – 1 laboratory**Bengkulu Province - 1 laboratory**West Nusa Tenggara Province - 1 laboratory* | *The capacity at provincial level to DNA-based investigation related to IWT operational to support:**At least 60% of the DNA-based investigations originating from the three provinces is undertaken by the new capacitated local laboratories* |
| **Outputs to achieve Outcome 2** | ***Output 2.1: Strengthened SMART implementation in the framework of RBM (Resort Base Management) with multi-stakeholder involvement in high conservation areas by strengthening existing SMART patrol system*** ***Output 2.2: Community Patrol Model established, operationalized and integrated into SMART-RBM system in target sites*** ***Output 2.3 Strengthened local institutional capacity for Wildlife Genetic Assessment to support Law Enforcement Monitoring (LEM)***  |
| **Component 3: Improved private sector and community engagement and diversified financing for biodiversity conservation across the selected landscapes**  |
| **Outcome 3** Increased private sector and community engagement in biodiversity and species conservation | ***Indicator 12****:**Area of forests and forest lands set-aside as wildlife corridors and/or under improved conservation practice in private holdings**This will include forests in private forest concessions and industrial plantations that will support improving key threatened species habitats in Sumatra (Aceh and Bengkulu)*  | *0 (no wildlife corridors established in project sites)* | *Around 5,000 ha of forests and forest lands set-aside as wildlife corridors and/or under improved conservation practice* | *At least 60,000 hectares of forests and forest lands set-aside as wildlife corridors and/or under improved conservation practice* |
| ***Indicator 13:*** *Number of private forest concessionary and industrial plantation business models with improved conservation outcomes under effective implementation as measured by:**-Business plans fully integrating conservation outcomes**-Increase in private funding allocated for conservation activities**-Number of dedicated staff implementing conservation activities* | *Baseline of existing conservation-friendly business models will be assessed in Year 1* | *At least 6 additional forest concessionary and industrial plantation business plans developed and agreed to and staff trained to implement these plans* | *At least 6 additional forest concessionary and industrial plantation business plans effectively implemented for conservation outcomes with 50 % increase in funding* |
| ***Indicator 14:*** *Increase in income of community members that includes women headed households from community enterprise.**-High-value products from coffee, cacao, turmeric, durian, rattan fiber and rattan fruit (“Dragon’s Blood” dye)=.**-Status of community development fund**This list will be refined during initial consultation with local communities* *Baseline incomes of households are as follows: Ulu Masen between USD 750-1980/year (Source Socioeconomic and Gender Profiles of North Sumatra 2016)**Bengkulu around USD 750/year (Source: Senoaji 2009)**Moyo island USD 865 – 1,500/year (Source: Achmand, B and Diniyati D 2018). The variance in earnings within landscapes is dependent on livelihood sources. These figures will be validated for the project sites during the community consultation process in Year 1* | *Baselines of average incomes will be established in Year 1 for each site.**No village Development Fund exists* | *At least 5% average increase in income for 25% of participating households based on action plans for improved business models agreed and implementation initiated in Year 2 (at least 20% beneficiary households must be women-headed). Village Development Funds established* | *At least 15% average increase in income for 75% of participating households based on action plans for improved business models agreed and under implementation initiated (at least 20% beneficiary households must be women-headed). Village Development Funds operational* |
| **Outputs to achieve Outcome 3** | ***Output 3.1: Private sector partners actively engaged in environmentally-friendly practices*** ***Output 3.2: Incentive/reward system developed and implemented in private sector business planning for reducing forest degradation and improving to promote wildlife conservation in forest concessions*** ***Output 3.3:*** *Innovative mechanisms that promote sustainable traditional hunting practices by integrating local wisdom and experiences to generate revenues for local communities (particularly in Moyo landscape)****Output 3.4: Community-based biodiversity-friendly livelihood and business enterprises promoted for sustainable use of natural resources and avoid biodiversity loss*** |
| **Component 4: Upscaling/replication of project approaches at national and regional level** |
| **Outcome 4** **Effective knowledge management, gender mainstreaming and monitoring and evaluation for key species conservation enhanced** | ***Indicator 15****: Level of awareness on IWT, KEE and threatened species conservation in the landscapes as indicated by KAP survey.*  | *Baseline survey will be established in Year 1* *Currently coordinated outreach on conservation threats lacking. Limited awareness of impact of unplanned development among general public.*  | *At least 40% sampled community members, government and sector agency staff, private sector and other stakeholders (at least 40% women) aware of potential conservation threats and adverse impacts of unplanned developments and actions needed for corridor conservation* | *At least 60% (of which at least 40% women) of sampled community members, government and sector agency staff, private sector and other stakeholders aware of potential conservation threats and adverse impacts of unplanned developments and behavior change for biodiversity outcomes* |
| ***Indicator 16****:* *Number of good practice conservation and sustainable resource management approaches documented and shared via GWP platform and other media.* *-Information management systems strengthened**-Annual learning workshops including participation in GWP annual meetings, regional workshops, HWC COP etc.* | *Limited number of good practices in conservation and sustainable resource management codified, disseminated and applied*  | *At least five good practices in conservation and sustainable resource management codified and adopted and shared with GWP platform and other media*  | *At least twenty good practice in conservation and sustainable resource management codified and disseminated nationally and adapted and shared with GWP platform and other media.*  |
| **Outputs to achieve Outcome 4** | ***Output 4.1: Knowledge Management and Communications, Gender Mainstreaming and Monitoring and Evaluation strategies developed and implemented******Output 4.2: Harmonized information management system to integrate lessons from the biological landscapes and user friendly operational*** ***Output 4.3: Knowledge Management and gender mainstreaming contribute to sharing of learning and advance replication and scaling up of gender sensitive biodiversity management approaches elsewhere in the country.*** |