

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Malaysia

Review PIF 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

Agenices

UNDP

Date received by PM

10/8/2019

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2019 - Not entirely. The Project is aligned with the SGP strategic directions approved for GEF-7.

However, the funding and activities under CCM2-6 ("Demonstrate mitigation options with systemic impacts for food systems, land use and restoration impact program") as presented are not eligible under the approved GEF-7 programming directions.

This is because, CCM-2's land use and restoration activities are only eligible in GEF-7 as they relate to the Food Systems, Land Use, and Restoration Impact Program (FOLUR IP). Please revise and select other climate change mitigation activities that are eligible under the approved GEF-7 Programming Directions (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/GEF-7%20Programming%20Directions%20-%20GEF_R.7_19.pdf).

11/7/2019 Table A has been revised and the climate change mitigation component is in line with the GEF-7 Programming Strategy.

Cleared

Agency Response Table A has been revised to reflect an eligible programming direction.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2019 Not at this stage. Please revise Table B further as per comment made above regarding Table A and the need to revise the proposed activities and outputs. Please refer to the comment on CCM2-6 above and reformulate Table B. For this purpose, please check the Programming Directions under the CCM Focal Area approved for GEF-7, particularly in terms of eligibility of agroecology activities. Outside the Impact Program investments, CCM Focal Area actions in GEF-7 are only eligible if they support developing countries to make transformational shifts towards low emission and climate-resilient development pathways. (see relevant pages of Annex A at: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.54.19.Rev_03_Replenishment.pdf)

11/7/2019 Table B has been revised.

Cleared

Agency Response

See highlighted amended text in Table B of the PIF and on page 17 under Output 1.2.2.

Co-financing

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2019 Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

4. 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2019 Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2019 Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2019 Yes. Cleared. The project requests a PPG of \$109,500 inclusive of Agency fees.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019 Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019. Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019 Not entirely. Please explain what are the main threats to biodiversity and climate change across the three landscapes that the project is trying to tackle. (only biodiversity was explained for landscape 1.)

Please revise

11/7/2019 Revised.

Cleared

Agency Response

Please see highlighted revised text on pages 7-9 of the PIF.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019 - In addition to the projects and initiatives conducted under the SGP in Malaysia, are there any other associated projects that are relevant for the baseline and which the SGP can build on?

Please revise

11/7/2019 Revised

Cleared

Agency Response Please see pages 11-12 for a list of initiatives in the three landscapes with short descriptions.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019 Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019. Please explain how the project is aligned with the Biodiversity and Climate Change Mitigation strategies approved for GEF-7.

Please revise

11/7/2019 Revised

Cleared

Agency Response

Please see highlighted text on page 20 under Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies in the PIF.

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019 Partially. Please address what are the main environmental problem, threats or barriers across the three landscapes that the project is trying to tackle. These refer to the threats to biodiversity and climate change in particular. In addition, please explain what the business as usual scenario is, that is what would the situation be without the GEF support, with only the ongoing and planned activities in the absence of the GEF and the expected/projected loss of GEBs if left unattended.

Please revise

11/7/2019 Revised

Cleared

Agency Response

Please see revised text on pages 20-21 of the PIF.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019- Is it possible to include an estimate for the carbon sequestration benefits? These are mentioned in the PIF (under sub-indicator 6.1). Perhaps the Agency can provide a rough estimate based on the hectare estimates under indicators 3 and 4 or, alternatively, use a proxy from similar projects (1 tCO₂e /1\$). These estimates can be refined at CEO endorsement, using the Ex-ACT tool and the 20-year accounting period.

Please revise

11/7/2019 Revised

Cleared

Agency Response

Please see pages 22-23 for rough estimates of carbon sequestration benefits, to be refined during project preparation.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019 - Partially. It's not cleared what is innovative about the participatory, multi-stakeholder approach. The SGP has been in Malaysia for 20 years, what's the next phase as Upgraded Country Program going to do differently and innovatively?

Please revise.

11/7/2019 Revised

Cleared

Agency Response

Please see revised text under section “innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up” on pages 23-24 of the PIF.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project’s/program’s intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019 Partially. There are maps but the coordinates where the landscapes are located are not clear.

Please revise.

11/7/2019 Revised

Cleared

Agency Response

Please see revised section Project Map and Coordinates on page 25 of the PIF.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019 Yes. Cleared. There's a thorough explanation of the stakeholders that will be engaged in the projects, their roles and the means of engagement.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019 Not sufficiently. Please provide indicative information on Gender considerations relevant to the project (what are the issues to address in terms of gender equality) and any measures to address these, including the process to collect sex-disaggregated data and information on Gender.

Please revise.

11/7/2019 Revised

Cleared

Agency Response

Please see revised section *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment* on pages 30-31 of the PIF.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019 Yes. Cleared.. It's provided in the stakeholder analysis.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019. Not entirely. Given the Updated Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards that came into effect on July 1, 2019, please provide indicative information regarding any additional Environmental and Social Risks and potential Impacts associated with the proposed project and any measures to address such risks and impacts. (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.55.07_ES_Safeguards.pdf)

Please revise.

11/7/2019 Explanation provided.

Cleared

Agency Response

After reviewing the GEF Updated Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards, no additional Environmental and Social Risks are apparent at this stage.

The UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) is aligned with the GEF Updated Policy of July 1, 2019. The social and environmental safeguards pre-screening was prepared during the PIF design phase identifying environmental and/or social risks and potential impacts of the project at this stage of project development, as well as measures to address them. During the course of project preparation, potential risks will continue to be identified and analyzed and then added to the Risk table in the Project Document if they are found to be valid. The risk table in the PIF on pages 28-30 is in line with the social and environmental safeguards pre-screening conducted as part of PIF development.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019 To some extent. Please describe the management, monitoring and evaluation arrangements of the country programme. Also, since the SGP in Malaysia is upgrading in GEF-7, please explain the transitional arrangements between the SGP global programme and the Upgraded Country Programme, including the change in systems, budget and resources allocation, staffing, etc. Please explain whether any other (than UNOPS) executing partner has been considered or will be considered in the future and the rationale for selecting UNOPS.

Please revise.

11/7/2019 Revised

Cleared

Agency Response Please see pages 33-34 under the Section on *Coordination* for additional text.
Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019. Partially. The project is consistent with the National Policy on Biological Diversity, the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing and the Copenhagen Action Plan under the UNFCCC.

Please explain how the three selected landscapes feature in national priorities.

Please revise.

11/7/2019 Revised

Cleared

Agency Response

Please see revised section *Consistency with National Priorities* on page 36 of the PIF.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019. Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

Part III – 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019 Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2019 Not at this stage. Please revise and answer the questions and comments above.

11/7/2019 Yes. The PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/17/2019 Please note that for CEO Endorsement, the Agency will be required to fill in a detailed budget template prepared by the GEF Secretariat. Such budget template will be shared in due course.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		