

Strengthening Malaysia's Capacity in Implementing and Tracking Ambitious Climate Change Actions

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10964

Countries

Malaysia

Project Name

Strengthening Malaysia's Capacity in Implementing and Tracking Ambitious
Climate Change Actions

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/8/2022

Review completed by PM

5/23/2022

Program Manager

Namrata Rastogi

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I ? Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/27/2022: Please change Rio Markers as follows: CC Mitigation: 2; CC adaptation: 1

Under Focal Area Outcomes, please replace CBIT with "Foster enabling conditions for mainstreaming mitigation concerns into sustainable development strategies through the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency".

5/20/2022: Cleared.

5/27/2022: In Table A, please add Focal Area Outcomes for CCM 3-8 - "Foster enabling conditions for mainstreaming mitigation concerns into sustainable development strategies through the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency". This change does not appear in the document.

5/31/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

The markers are changed as suggested.

5/28/2022

The change has been made in the portal as well. This is already reflected in the attached CEO ER document submitted.

2. Project description summary. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes this has been provided and the project design is appropriate.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

4. Co-financing. Are the confirmed amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/27/2022: The co-financing document has not been submitted. Please upload.

5/20/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response The correct co-finance letter has been uploaded in the portal.

5. GEF resource availability. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/27/2022: The GEF is in ongoing discussions with the OFP and the Agency on the selection of the correct source of funding. Based on these discussions, the table and other relevant items may need to be updated.

5/20/2022:: The project uses STAR allocation. Cleared.

Agency Response

The project is to support strengthening the Transparency framework which is defined as CCM 3-8 CBIT support though funds used by the country are their star allocation. The system doesn't allow this combination of CCM 3-8 with use of Star allocation. This has now been addressed and Table D reflects the use of CC Star Allocation.

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/27/2022: Please see comment above on the ongoing discussions between GEF/OFP and the Agency.

5/20/2022: The project uses STAR allocation and is within the resources available. Cleared.

Agency Response Addressed above

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: No PPG has been requested. N/A

Agency Response

7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes, this has been provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes, the project has been tagged appropriately.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Project Description. Is there sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

Agency Response

2. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: In Table 1, please fully fill out "NAP". We note some description of the CBIT project in relation to the BTR. However, please provide a table that outlines the

different outcomes of the two projects - CBIT project and BTR project request with GEF - and how this CBIT project and the BTR project will not overlap, and instead build on each other. This can be provided in this section or the coordination section.

5/20/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

The comment has been addressed. Information on BTR and Transparency Framework strengthening project compliment is added in the Project Description section.

3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/27/2022: We note that Outcome 2.1 mentions "training material to be embedded into the existing training systems..." We note that in the KM section there is mention of the ToT approach. We also note that the stakeholder section mentions exploring MOUs with technical institutes. Please elaborate on which approaches will be used, including how these strategies may be used for all training related activities in the CBIT project (such as Output 1.4, 3.1 etc.)

5/20/2022: The additional information provided is well noted. However, this information has only been provided in the prodoc and not in the portal document, specifically for the KM section. Please revise the portal document to align this information.

5/23/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

Multiple strategies are used to ensure capacity building opportunities are available in the countries. This includes

- (i) Engaging national experts and research/academic institute in developing training materials and training them as trainers, so that resources are available beyond the project duration for training government staff.
- (ii) Embedding the training material in the existing staff training organizations so as these elements become part of the training for new staff, which will be responsible for reporting work, recruited into the government

In addition to reduce the risk of staff turnover, the Ministry will explore signing MOUs with research/academic institutes to support the government with their expertise by providing human resources when needed.

The additional information is added in the CEO document in outputs as well as in the KM section.

23 May 2022

The information in the portal is updated (both Output section 1.4 and KM).

4. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes, this has been provided and is sufficient.

Agency Response

5. Project Description. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes this has been provided. However, the narrative here mentions a co-financing of \$430,000 while the table above states \$200,000. Please revise and align as needed.

5/20/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response This is has been corrected to USD 200,000, the amount of co-finance provided.

6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

Agency Response

7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes this is cleared.

Agency Response

8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

Agency Response

9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

10. Stakeholders. Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/27/2022: Yes, this has been provided. However, please include Ministry of Finance in the table (as per alternative scenario).

5/20/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response MoF is included in the stakeholder section.

11. Gender equality and women's empowerment. Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/27/2022: Yes, cleared.

5/27/2022: Please provide a response to the question below.

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? As the Agency said Yes to one of the three points, this umbrella question should also be Yes.

5/31/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response Yes indeed the project include gender responsive measures. This question has been answered in the portal.

12. Private sector engagement. If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

13. Risk. Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes, this has been provided including COVID risk and opportunities analysis.

Agency Response

14. Coordination. Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

Agency Response

15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes.

Agency Response

16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Please comment on how this project may engage with CBIT AFOLU global project.

5/20/2022: This has been included in the prodoc but is missing from the portal. Please include in the KM section. Additionally, we note the use of "Maldives" in this section. This seems to be a mistake - please revise.

5/23/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

This has been included in the Coordination section of the document.

23 May 2022

This has been updated in the Coordination section.

Yes indeed we used Maldives in place of Malaysia. This has been corrected.

17. Monitoring and Evaluation. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/27/2022: Yes.

5/20/2022: The description here states that the total budget for M&E activities is \$41,750. This is different from the total in the table and the Table B. Please check and revise as needed. Additionally, please check the total in the table provided in the M&E section in the prodoc. The amounts stated here are different from the portal and the version in the prodoc adds up to \$44,250 not \$45,250. Please ensure that the two documents are aligned.

5/23/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response The total Budget for M&E is 45,250. This has been update and made consistent in the Prodoc as well as in the portal.

18. Benefits. Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

Agency Response

19. Annexes:

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes.

Agency Response

20. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS):

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes, this has been provided and marked as low.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

Agency Response
Part III ? Country and Agency Endorsements

1. Country endorsements. Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2022: Yes, this has been endorsed by the GEF OFP - Noor Afifah Binti Abdul Razak.

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/27/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/20/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/27/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

4/27/2022: Please address comments.

5/20/2022: Please address remaining comments.

5/23/2022: PM recommends technical clearance.

5/27/2022: Please address remaining comments.

5/31/2022: PM recommends clearance.