

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Malaysia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10363

Countries

Malaysia

Project Name

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Malaysia

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

5/7/2021

Review completed by PM

10/25/2021

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 9, 2021 HF:

Comments cleared.

June 18, 2021 HF:

1.) No, although Table A includes funding from the BD and CCM STAR focal areas, the project design seems like generic/generalized set of components that repeatedly references LD and the LD focal area-particularly in Component 1, but not exclusively so: (including in the long-term vision of the project and in Component 1, references "relevant GEF focal areas, "including Land Degradation"). Further, the project includes explicit LD targets for 3.1 and 4.3 and the CER contains many LD-type activities including: production land restoration, restoration of degraded land, rehabilitation of degraded soils etc. Any restoration with GEF-7 BD funds must be specifically focused on improving key corridors and connectivity/integrity of biodiverse ecosystems rather than more general restoration and rehabilitation of production lands, soils etc. Please revise the project design, justification and targets (in CER and ProDoc) with a focus on GEF-7 BD and CCM focal area strategies and core indicators, understanding that this project is taking a broader landscape approach that may accrue multiple benefits. The use of co-financing for complementary and specific LD activities is an option, but these activities are not eligible in the BD or CCM strategy for funding under GEF-7.

2.) Please change the Rio Marker for Mitigation to 2 and Adaptation to 0.

-

Agency Response

08 August 2021:

1.) The narrative description of the project strategy has been revised by stressing that the BD and CCM interventions will generate multiple benefits, including land degradation benefits, rather than specific interventions designed under the LD focal area. The overall end target for Core Indicator 3 (1,000 ha) is the same as the figure presented in the PIF. The breakdown across the sub-indicators has been revised in the CEO ER, shifting 500 ha into sub-indicator 4.2 (Area of forest and forest land restored), which corresponds to connectivity/integrity in forest ecosystems. The end target also includes 500 ha under sub-indicator 3.1 (Area of degraded agricultural land restored) ? the PIF version had the entire 1,000-ha end target under sub-indicator 3.1.

The overall end target for Core Indicator 4 (43,000 ha) is the same as the figure presented in the PIF, and the breakdown across the sub-indicators has been revised in the CEO ER, shifting more area into the biodiversity conservation sub-indicators 4.1 and 4.2.

The narrative descriptions of Outputs 1.1.1, 1.2.1., and 2.1.1. have been revised, with more specific information regarding the three project landscapes.

2.) The Rio Market for Mitigation has been changed to 2 and the one for Adaption changed to 0 in the GEF Taxonomy Worksheet (Annex G to the CEO ER and Annex 17 to the Project Document).

Project description summary

2. 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

September 9, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

June 18, 2021 HF:

1.) The project in the CER structure/design strikes as a generic set of components and activities rather than a customized design for Malaysia SGP and given the understood needs of the target landscapes. Please revise in the Component, Outcome, Output descriptions of the CER.

Agency Response

08 August 2021:

The narrative descriptions of Outputs 1.1.1, 1.2.1., and 2.1.1. have been revised, with more specific information regarding the three project landscapes.

The project strategy is based on the overall landscape approach applied by other SGP Upgraded Country Programmes, which uses lessons and experiences gained through the Community Development and Knowledge Management for the Satoyama Initiative Programme (COMDEKS). This approach has successfully demonstrated the validity and strategic importance of collective action by communities to enhance resilience of their socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes (SEPLS) ? these include areas of biodiversity importance: ICCAs, corridors, PA buffer zones, etc. Some ?generic? descriptions might be anticipated given that a) grant projects are designed based on landscape strategy development during Project implementation, so describing specific details of each grant project is not overly credible at this stage. More detailed descriptions of potential grant projects will be made by the landscape stakeholders through the participatory baseline assessments and development of participatory landscape strategies.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected 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, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 25, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

October 18, 2021 HF:

According to the definition stipulated by the AFD (Agence Francaise de Development): The Habitat Foundation should be categorized as Civil Society Organization and not Private Sector. Please revise.

September 9, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

June 18, 2021 HF:

Please revise the part of Section C (pg 9) on how investment mobilized co-finance was identified. Currently it contains text on the core indicator targets which should go underneath the indicator table.

Agency Response

Agency Response:

19 October 2021:

The source of co-financing for the Habitat Foundation has been changed from private sector to civil society organization. The description of Private Sector Engagement (Section 4 in the CER) and the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Annex 8 to the Project Document) have also been revised accordingly.

08 August 2021:

The information below is provided in Section C of the CEO ER Word document following the co-financing table; this has been now correctly reflected in the portal.

Civil society: SGP global policy requests grant recipient CSOs to contribute to their projects in cash to the best of their abilities. The National Steering Committee will foster compliance with this policy as appropriate. These contributions will only be confirmed during project implementation, as grant projects are approved. Investment mobilized by CSOs corresponds to new and additional funding for the approved interventions.

Recipient Country Government: The Ministry of Environment and Water (KASA) and Sabah Parks have committed in-kind (recurrent expenditures) co-financing. The in-kind contributions from KASA correspond to staff salaries, logistical services, and other support to the OP7 project, and facilitating linkages with priorities of the ministry, particularly involving capacitating local communities, increasing participatory models and building resilience on climate change mitigation and adaptation in the context of local sustainable development. For Sabah Parks, the co-financing contributions are also connected with staff salaries and logistical support services, specifically involving complementary community development initiatives associated with the Crocker Range Biosphere Reserve and National Park.

Private Sector. The Habitat Foundation has confirmed grant co-financing (investment mobilized) for investments that strengthen local and indigenous participation in conservation, e.g., by enhancing connectivity and conservation outside formal protected areas or by strengthening their roles within existing protected areas. In Sabah and Sarawak, there is interest in exploring initiatives that document Local Ecological Knowledge, biodiversity values, and Community-based Natural Resource Management

(CBNRM) strategies to strengthen environmental resilience, co-governance, and local economic opportunities. In the Klang Valley landscape, Habitat Foundation has indicated their continued support for community-based conservation in conjunction with advocacy for the protection of forested slopes and forest fragments in the urban landscape with an emphasis on slope protection and disaster risk-management, climate-change adaptation, and preserving spaces for biodiversity.

Other Donor Agency: The BMU, through ICCA-GSI funded from their International Climate Initiative (IKI), has committed grant (investment mobilized) co-financing to support activities of the SGP for Indigenous Peoples and Community Conserved Territories and Areas. The BMU provided additional top-up funds to the ICCA-GSI in November 2020 in response to the COVID-19 global pandemic.

UNDP: The confirmed in-kind (recurrent expenditures) co-financing from UNDP corresponds to staff salaries, logistical services and other support to the OP 7 project, fostering synergies with the priorities of the UNDP Country Programme Document, particularly in regard to capacitating local communities and increasing participatory and sustainable management of natural resources and biodiversity.

The difference between confirmed co-financing at CEO Endorsement Request and the indicative co-financing in the PIF ?:

The total confirmed co-financing at the time of submission of the CEO Endorsement Request is USD 2.75 million. The indicative co-financing outlined in the PIF was USD 4.1 million. The largest difference between the indicative contributions at the PIF stage compared to the confirmed figures is associated with the co-financing from CSO grantees. The indicative value of these contributions outlined in the PIF totaled USD 3.2 million, which is more than the GEF grant. The confirmed value of co-financing represents approximately a ratio of 1:1 with the grant portion of the project budget. Indicative contributions from the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources and the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industries were included in the PIF; however, co-financing from these partners was not secured during the project preparation phase. Consultations with these partners and other potential co-financing partners will continue during the implementation phase of the project. A contribution of USD 500,000 in grant (investment mobilized) co-financing was made by German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) in relation to the Global ICCA Support Initiative (ICCA GSI), which is funded by the International Climate Initiative (IKI) of the BMU.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 13, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

September 9, 2021 HF:

1.) Please note the significant decrease in GHZG emission reduction from PIF to CER for sub-indicator 6.2 **and please explain/justify the decrease from 300,000 to 6,500 metric tons given the GEF financing amount for CCM remains the same.** Also, please note, any targets under 6.1 should ONLY be a function of those hectares conserved with BD resources given that in GEF-7 CCM resources are to be used for energy efficiency GEBs, rather than in AFOLU sectors.

2-3.) Comments cleared.

Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)	300,000	6,500		
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)		26,000		
Anticipated start year of accounting		2022		
Duration of accounting		20		

June 18, 2021 HF:

- 1.) Box 7: Please comment on the large difference in the target for Sub-indicator 6.2 when compared at PIF.
- 2.) Please provide an estimate for Sub-indicator 6.4 or clarify why it was not provided.
- 3.) See previous comment on indicator/target setting for BD.

Agency Response

28 September 2021:

1.) Indicative CCM renewable energy and energy efficiency interventions for the OP7 project were described during the PPG phase, based on stakeholder consultations and baseline studies of the target landscapes, and building upon the preliminary considerations presented in the PIF. The preliminary estimates made during the PIF stage for sub-Indicator 6.2 were based primarily on micro-hydro installations. Calculations of GHG emissions avoided were updated during the PPG phase, applying the same cumulative capacity of the units (0.06 MW). The PIF estimates of GHG emission avoided through RE/EE interventions were found to be over-estimated. Detailed estimations of GHG emissions avoided through the indicative RE/EE interventions are presented in Annex 15 to the Project Document (Estimations of GEF 7 Core Indicator end targets).

The proposed end target for sub-indicator 6.1 represent benefits achieved in the AFOLU sector. The 6.1 end target does not include estimated GHG emissions avoided through renewable energy and energy efficiency interventions; those benefits are reflected in the target for sub-indicator 6.2.

8 August 2021:

1.) Preliminary estimations made at the PIF stage regarding GHG emissions avoided through renewable energy interventions, namely micro-hydro installations were updated at the PPG phase after identifying and analyzing potential indicative RE and EE interventions in the three project landscapes.

2.) A target for Sub-indicator 6.4 is included in the GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet: 0.06 MW (small hydropower). This is the same value indicated in the preliminary worksheet in the PIF.

3.) The overall end target for Core Indicator 4 (43,000 ha) is the same as the figure presented in the PIF, and the breakdown across the sub-indicators is similar, with the CEO ER version shifting more area into the biodiversity conservation sub-indicators 4.1 and 4.2.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a 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

October 4, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

September 9, 2021 HF:

Please make revisions to the CER that reflect these perspectives, justification and approach provided below.

June 18, 2021 HF:

1.) Please justify the selection of the highly urbanized, highly-altered Klang valley for support under the GEF-7 SGP and how activities in this landscape will align with the CCM and BD strategies (on the conservation of globally significant biodiversity and renewable energy/energy efficiency, respectively). As it stands, work on urban green space is outside the scope of the GEF-7 biodiversity focal area strategy, but work to conserve and reduce drivers of biodiversity loss via community forests and biodiverse landscapes could align with the strategy. Please revise.

2.) It is unclear how the activities under GEF-7 SGP would begin to counteract the myriad threats to remaining biodiversity in the Klang Valley. As described in the CER the activities proposed do not seem aligned or commensurate with the large-scale, urbanized threats to the remaining patches of forest and other intact ecosystems in this region. Please explain and revise.

3.) Please describe how work will be focused and concentrated within Klang Valley which is a large, highly populous area as to not be diffuse and dilute given the low level of finances available, the high number of focal landscapes in project and significant population (even with co-financing resources would be stretched very thin).

Agency Response

28 September 2021:

The perspectives, justification, and approach for the Klang Valley landscape were updated in the CER, under Incremental/additional cost reasoning (Section 5) and Potential for Scaling Up (Section 5). These revisions were also reflected in the Project Document.

08 August 2021:

1.) The Klang Valley landscape was one of the three landscapes approved at the PIF stage, in consultation with the OFP and the SGP National Steering Committee (NSC). The Klang Valley contains large areas harboring globally significant biodiversity, including the Hulu-Gombak-Sungai Lalang Forest Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) at the northeast part of the project landscape, and the North-central Selangor Coast KBA, located at the southwest part of the landscape. The stakeholder consultations carried out during the PPG phase and baseline studies have identified a role for the SGP in helping to coordinate the activities of civil society organizations in the landscape towards achieving a more inclusive and more organized stakeholder network working on community forest management, including the community forests buffering the Selangor State Park, which covers part of the Hulu-Gombak-Sungai Lalang Forest KBA.

2.) Civil society organizations are more active in the Klang Valley, as compared to the other two project landscapes. The SGP grants are expected to provide incremental support to ongoing initiatives in the landscape, facilitating increased protection of globally significant biodiversity and demonstrating low emission development approaches that can be upscaled elsewhere in the landscape and other parts of Malaysia. Through the SGP strategic grant modality, the OP7 project is envisaged to help develop a network/umbrella organization to act as a catalyst for grassroots community forest initiatives.

3.) There is a high likelihood that the experienced CSOs in this landscape will be able to raise co-financing contributions from the private sector, foundations, other donors. This would also help increase the visibility of the SGP in Malaysia in general ? and possibly lead to partnerships in the other two landscapes as well. The project strategy also aims to build on and upscale earlier achievements of SGP interventions, e.g., the Kota Damansara Community Forest (KDCF) Society has been successful in protecting the Kota Damansara Forest through conservation, education, and research in partnership with other civil society organizations, national and local government entities, private sector enterprises, and the donor community.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 9, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

June 18, 2021 HF:

1.) Part II: Project Justification; Please provide additional information regarding the existing state of energy access, including sources of energy, and access to energy efficiency technologies in the selected landscapes, as well as on any relevant baseline activities in this regard.

Agency Response

08 August 2021:

1.) Each of the three landscape profiles (Annex 12 to the Project Document) contain Low Emission Development Situation Analyses. These situation analyses include information on challenges associated with access and reliability of clean energy sources, complementary baseline initiatives, key stakeholders, and opportunities for the SGP OP7 regarding climate change mitigation. The situation analyses will be expanded through the participatory baseline assessments, to be carried out in each of the three landscapes at the start of the implementation phase.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 9, 2021 HF:

All comments cleared.

June 18, 2021 HF:

- 1.) Please further customize the project design based on the identified landscapes.
- 2.) Include a succinct (couple of sentences) articulation of the project TOC that includes the causal pathways. The current description of each is appreciated but a brief umbrella TOC narrative is appreciated.

3.) Outcome 1.1: From the perspective of sustainability and efficacy, it seems like the use and support and transformation of existing multi-stakeholder platforms is preferable to establishment thereof. Please describe, and revise the CER accordingly to prioritize/allow space for existing platforms.

4.) Please clarify how climate change concerns are being integrated in Component 2.

Agency Response

08 August 2021:

1.) As described earlier, the project strategy is predicated on the basic landscape approach applied by other SGP Upgraded Country Programmes, based on lessons and experiences gained through the Community Development and Knowledge Management for the Satoyama Initiative Programme (COMDEKS), which strengthened community collective action to enhance resilience of socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes (SEPLS). Further customization will be made by the landscape stakeholders during project implementation through the participatory baseline assessments and development of participatory landscape strategies.

2.) A brief umbrella TOC narrative has been added.

3.) The narrative description of Output 2.1.1 (Multi-stakeholder platforms established and/or strengthened for improved governance of target landscapes) has been updated by pointing out that "Preference will be given to linking into and strengthening existing multi-stakeholder platforms?". The landscape profiles in Annex 12 to the Project Document contain information on existing platforms in the target landscapes.

4.) Climate change concerns will be addressed in the landscape strategies. The narrative description of Output 2.1.2 has been updated by indicating that the landscape strategies will include "potential climate change impacts and low emission development opportunities?".

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 9, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

June 22, 2021 HF:

No, please complete CER section 4.) Alignment with focal area strategies taking into account previous comments on GEF-7 FA alignment for CCM 1-1 and BD 1-1.

Agency Response

08 August 2021:

Section 4 of the CEO ER has been expanded with more information on alignment with focal area strategies.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 9, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

June 22, 2021 HF:

Please see previous comments regarding design and alignment.

Agency Response

08 August 2021:

The narrative descriptions of Outputs 1.1.1, 1.2.1., and 2.1.1. have been revised, with more specific information regarding the three project landscapes.

The project strategy is predicated on the landscape approach applied by other SGP Upgraded Country Programmes, based on lessons and experiences gained through the Community Development and Knowledge Management for the Satoyama Initiative Programme (COMDEKS) which strengthened community collective action to enhance resilience of socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes (SEPLS). Further customization will be made by landscape stakeholders through the participatory baseline assessments and development of participatory landscape strategies.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 9, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

June 22, 2021 HF:

Please see previous comments regarding design and alignment.

Agency Response

08 August 2021:

The narrative descriptions of Outputs 1.1.1, 1.2.1., and 2.1.1. have been revised, with more specific information regarding the three project landscapes. Further customization will be made by the landscape stakeholders through the participatory baseline assessments and development of participatory landscape strategies.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

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

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

Child Project

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

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

September 9, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes, but in Annex 8 please correct the typo with the dates of the stakeholder meetings which presumably took place in 2020, rather than those months in 2021.

Very nice graphs plotting the stakeholders by level of interest and level of influence for each landscape.

Agency Response

08 August 2021:

The typographical error was corrected to 2020 in Annex 8 (Stakeholder engagement plan).

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

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

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

September 9, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes, although this section does not provide much detail or articulation of the project's approach to private sector engagement throughout the broad areas identified. Please elaborate.

Agency Response

08 August 2021

The Private Sector Engagement section has been elaborated in the CER.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

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

October 4, 2021 HF:

2. a & b. Cleared with the understanding that UNDP will not be executing any activities under this project or on behalf of the EA or government.

September 9, 2020 HF:

1.) Comment cleared.

2.) a.) If, per the activities described in the ProDoc and CER there are limited UNDP execution support services proposed, please submit a letter from the GEF OFP requesting limited execution support and specifying execution activities/role; and

b.) Please note the UNDP audit checklist in the Portal documents tab states (below). If UNDP execution support services are now envisioned (given what is contained in the CER and ProDoc and referenced in the GEFSEC review previously), please address 2a above, and revise the checklist accordingly.

No execution support services are envisioned or have been agreed with the GEF Secretariat. The project is executed by UNOPS through the UN agency implementation modality, and UNDP execution support services are not envisioned.

June 22, 2021 HF:

1.) Please explain how and why was UNOPS selected as the EA. What other organizations were considered and why not selected? Given GEF's interest in building country and local institutional capacity and sustainability it is unclear how working with UNOPS as EA fulfills this objective particularly given the high-capacity within Malaysia and existing organizations that could undertake the execution of a small grants portfolio. We see that these questions were asked at PIF stage, but never sufficiently responded in the review sheet or PIF.

2.) Given UNDP, as the GEF IA must not engage in tasks related to the execution of this project, please explain, justify or redact any activities that qualify or relate to execution for which UNDP will undertake or "support". For example: in para 229 of the UNDP ProDoc related to the execution of this project (including UNDP acting "on behalf of" UNOPS; making available technical expertise; and providing "other types of support at the local level" as required) as well as para 233 of the ProDoc (including UNDP acting "on behalf of" UNOPS). See pasted text from the ProDoc below.

233. A key service of UNOPS is the contracting of SGP staff as needed and required by the Programme, and once contracted, UNOPS provides guidance and supervision, together with the UNDP CO acting on behalf of UNOPS, to the SGP country staff in their administrative and finance related work. UNOPS also provides other

229. The UNDP **Country Office** is the business unit in UNDP for the SGP project and ensuring the project meets its objective and delivers on its targets. The Resident Representative negotiates agreements with beneficiary organizations on behalf of UNOPS. The Country Office will leverage its expertise in various environment and development fields as shown below. It will also provide technical support at the local level such as infrastructure and financial management services, as requested and represented in the NSC and will actively participate in grant monitoring activities. The CO will organize meetings, promoting synergies with other relevant Programmes, and support the design and implementation of the SGP strategy, among other things.

Agency Response

28 September 2021:

2) The reference to UNDP execution support is standard text found in all Upgraded Country Programme Project Documents, including all that have been approved to date by the GEF Secretariat. Note that the execution support provided by UNDP to SGP Country Programme projects is based on the partnership framework described in the 2009 MOU between UNOPS (Executing Agency) and UNDP, which is also referenced in the checklist. Note that the reference to the MOU and partnership framework is standard in all checklists for UCP projects approved by GEF Secretariat to date.

08 August 2021:

1.) Consistent with the OP7 SGP Implementation Arrangement Paper, the selection of UNOPS as the EA was made to minimize risk and ensure continuity in transitioning from OP6 to OP7, in particular considering that this is the first phase of SGP Malaysia as a UCP. UNOPS is currently the EA for OP6 and a number of OP6 interventions are ongoing, in part delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Moreover, no objections regarding the selection of UNOPS as EA were raised by the OFP or the NSC.

2.) UNDP concurs with the need to maintain a separation between implementation and execution functions. Where the UNDP COs are requested to perform the above execution functions on behalf of UNOPS, it is noted that appropriate arrangements will be put in place to ensure the functional and institutional separation and distinction of reporting lines between those persons in the UNDP CO involved in an oversight role and those persons involved in execution support. Such separation of functions will follow the UNDP NCE programming guidelines as well as the GEF Policies and Procedures.

The audit checklist further clarifies the separate roles of UNDP and UNOPS.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

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

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

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

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

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

October 25, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

October 18, 2021 HF:

Neither the M&E Plan, nor the Results Framework, available in the ProDoc describe the means of verification, sources, frequency of updates and methodology. Please revise to add these elements. This is in line with paragraph 26 on M&E design of Annex 12 of the Project Cycle Guidelines which states: ?To assess the quality of the M&E plan, the evaluators will assess: Was the M&E plan at the point of CEO Endorsement practical and sufficient? Did it include baseline data? Did it specify clear targets and appropriate (SMART) indicators to track environmental, gender, and socio economic results; a proper methodological approach; specify practical organization and logistics of the M&E activities including schedule and responsibilities for data collection; and, budget adequate funds for M&E activities??

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

19 October 2021:

The Monitoring Plan (Annex 4 to the Project Document) includes descriptions of the indicators and targets in the project results framework, data sources and collection methods, frequency of planned monitoring and evaluation, responsibilities for data collection, means of verification, and risks and assumptions.

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

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 28, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared. Budget in Annex E of the Portal entry is now legible.

October 26, 2021 HF:

Please ensure that the budget table in Annex E in the Portal entry is readable. Currently it is too small to be legible so we are not able to clearly see any revisions. Please revise and resubmit. Noted that Annex 1 is included as an attachment in documents tab.

October 18, 2021 HF:

The budget table shows miscellaneous expenses of \$10,000 charged across all components and PMC ? GEF funds cannot be used for unspecified miscellaneous expenses.

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

19 October 2021:

Miscellaneous expenses have been removed from the project budget. The total budget and work plan and associated budget notes (Section IX of the Project Document) and the GEF budget template (Annex 1 to the Project Document) have been revised accordingly.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 9, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

June 22, 2021 HF:

Please respond directly to Germany's comments to be addressed at CER stage including how the comments were taken into account in the project design. These comments can be accessed in the "Stakeholder Comments" section of the Portal entry for this project.

Agency Response

08 August 2021:

Responses to the two comments made by Germany have been added to Annex B (Response to Project Reviews) to the CEO ER.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 22, 2021 HF:

Yes

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

NA

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 NA

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 NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 28, 2021 HF:

Yes, all comments cleared. Project must be circulated for Council 4-week review. Cancellation deadline is December 18th. Give that, please circulate for Council review in the next couple of days. Thank you.

October 25, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

October 18, 2021 HF:

No, please review final remaining comments highlighted in **yellow** and return as soon as possible. The second cancellation deadline for this project is December 19, 2021. Please note the project also must undergo a 4-week GEF Council review period prior to endorsement. Given that, the project must gain GEFSEC technical/policy clearance in the next 7-10 days to allow sufficient time for Council review and addressing final issues. If given the scope of the feedback the project team thinks this won't be possible, then please work with the OFP to prepare an extension request letter to have in case we are hitting up against the December deadline.

October 13, 2021 HF:

Yes.

September 9, 2021 HF:

No, please address all comments in review sheet, revise documentation and resubmit. Thank you.

June 22, 2021 HF:

No, please address all comments in review sheet, revise documentation and resubmit. Thank you.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	6/22/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/9/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/4/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/18/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/25/2021

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations