



# REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Mainstreaming of Biodiversity Conservation into River Management			
Country(ies):	Malaysia	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	5692
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5281
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Department of Irrigation and Drainage Malaysia, Global Environment Centre	Submission Date: Resubmission Date:	May 20, 2015 June 25, 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	48 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	133,380
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>		

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD2	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation	Output 2. National and sub-national land-use plans (3) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation.	GEF TF	815,000	6,480,000
BD2	Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks	Output 2.2. Policies and regulatory frameworks (1) for production sectors.	GEF TF	462,000	450,000
<b>Project management costs</b>			GEF TF	127,000	650,000
<b>Total project costs</b>				1,404,000	7,580,000

### B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

<b>Project Objective: To mainstream biodiversity conservation into riverine landscapes through improved river planning and management practices in Malaysia</b>						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. An operational institutional framework and capacity are established for strengthened	TA	Strengthened institutional environment for riverine biodiversity management, catalysing improved management of riverine habitats in Malaysia, indicated by:	1.1 Inter-agency Strategy to mainstream biodiversity into river management developed and adopted including: (i) an interagency coordination mechanism with clear	GEF TF	462,000	450,000

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

management of riverine biodiversity in production landscapes		<p>(i) adoption of an inter-agency riverine biodiversity management strategy and Best Management Practice guidelines; (ii) improved sector policy and regulatory environment as recorded in the GEF BD 2 tracking tool (see <b>Annex 6</b>); (iii) increase in dedicated Federal and state budget for riverine biodiversity management to at least USD1 million per annum.</p> <p>Strengthened capacity of government, private sector and community stakeholders towards mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in river management, indicated by: (i) strengthened riverine ecosystem staff capacity within DID and other relevant agencies as indicated by increase in UNDP capacity development scorecard from baseline of 17% to target of 50% (see <b>Annex 4</b>); (ii) 60% of key agency staff and other national and state level stakeholders targeted by knowledge, attitudes and practices programme activities demonstrate understanding of the values of riverine biodiversity and ecosystem services, the approach needed for a holistic and integrated approach for effective river management, and the responsibilities of different stakeholders (see <b>Annex 5</b>).</p>	<p>jurisdictions of concerned agencies; (ii) coordinated enforcement and compliance monitoring mechanisms; (iii) clear plans for mainstreaming riverine biodiversity management into operations of related sector agencies, private sector and communities; (iv) a collaborative operational modality; (v) a national action plan; and (vi) a financing plan.</p> <p>1.2: Best Management Practice (BMP) guidelines for management of riverine biodiversity developed, adopted and made widely available for application by NRE and DID, including economic valuation of riverine biodiversity and ecosystem services and tourism development assessment.</p> <p>1.3: Institutional capacity of NRE, DID and other related Federal and state agencies and key non-governmental stakeholders enhanced based on a capacity needs assessment through: (i) strengthened riverine ecosystem staff capacity within DID and other relevant agencies; (ii) development and implementation of training modules and programmes; and (iii) knowledge, attitudes and practices programme activities targeting policy makers and practitioners.</p>			
2. Best management practices for critical riverine habitats are demonstrated, enhancing biodiversity	TA	Status of globally significant biodiversity enhanced through erosion control and strengthened watershed management of 17,000ha of biodiversity-rich	2.1: Biodiversity management strengthened and habitat enhanced through improved reservoir catchment management in Upper Kinta River Basin,	GEF TF	815,000	6,480,000

<p>conservation status and reducing threats</p>		<p>catchment forests in the Central Forest Spine through multi-stakeholder partnership in upper Kinta Basin, indicated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) 50% reduction in annual sediment loads entering Sultan Aziz Shah over 2013 baseline</li> <li>(ii) reduced level of forest clearance for orchards in traditional lands (&lt;1ha / year)</li> <li>(iii) total ban on all other land clearance in the dam catchment decreed and enforced by the Perak State Government.</li> </ul> <p>Pressures on riverine habitat in targeted sections of the upper Klang river avoided and reduced through integration of biodiversity conservation within the Klang River of Life Programme, indicated by: (i) adoption of at least 4km of river stretches by local stakeholders through partnership agreements with responsible authorities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(ii) riverine and riparian habitats are rehabilitated to semi-natural condition in at least 4 locations in the upper Klang River system benefiting riverine biodiversity;</li> <li>(iii) 80% awareness of AIS risks among targeted stakeholder groups</li> </ul> <p>Biodiversity-rich riparian habitat protected and enhanced in partnership with the private sector and local communities in the Segama river basin, indicated by: (i) At least an additional 20km of riparian habitat protected and enhanced through partnership agreements in strategically important areas for biodiversity</p>	<p>including: (i) development of a multi-stakeholder catchment management strategy and action plan; (ii) implementation of priority actions including improved erosion control through community based forest rehabilitation, strengthened inter-agency coordination mechanisms to address major highway and highland agro-tourism development impacts on reservoir catchment integrity and water quality; (iii) introduction of dialogue mechanisms, alternative land development approaches and sustainable livelihood incomes for indigenous communities; and (iv) enhanced protection of upper Kinta catchment and rivers.</p> <p>2.2 Riverine biodiversity management integrated into planning and implementation of urban river management programmes in the Klang River Basin, including: (i) community-based riverine and riparian habitat creation and rehabilitation; (ii) stakeholder adoption of selected river stretches and networking of community-based river protection groups; (iii) awareness raising and facilitation of controls on aquatic AIS; and (iv) mainstreaming of community participation and biodiversity into the RoL programme through empowerment, training and awareness programmes.</p> <p>2.3: Riparian habitat protected and enhanced in partnership with the private sector and local communities in Kinabatangan and/or Segama rivers, through: (i) establishment of riparian corridors to link conservation areas; (ii) enhancing biodiversity</p>			
-------------------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--

		conservation; (ii) 10 honorary river rangers and 10 honorary wildlife rangers recruited from local communities, trained and engaged, and evaluated for upscaling by DID; (iii) at least 20 DID, EPD, SWD and other relevant agency staff trained in riverine biodiversity monitoring methods and protocols agreed.  Community involvement at all demonstration sites provides socio-economic benefits to local communities and proactively engages women, indicated by: number of households in target communities receiving income from project supported activities; percentage of women in sustainable livelihood groups supported by the project.	management in the riparian areas of the oil palm plantations; (iii) up-scaling of community based riparian zone protection and rehabilitation.			
			Subtotal		1,277,000	6,930,000
Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>3</sup>				GEF TF	127,000	650,000
<b>Total project costs</b>					1,404,000	7,580,000

### C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Department of Irrigation and Drainage / other federal agencies	Cash	5,850,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	260,000
Local Government	3 State governments (Perak, Selangor and Saba)	In kind	750,000
CSO	Global Environment Centre	Cash	300,000
CSO	Global Environment Centre	In kind	420,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			7,580,000

<sup>3</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>**

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Malaysia	1,404,000	133,380	1,537,380
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				1,404,000	133,380	1,537,380

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

**F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	0	0	0
National/Local Consultants	12,000	0	12,000

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No.**

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>4</sup>**

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc. N/A

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. N/A

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage: N/A

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address: N/A

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

There are no major changes to the incremental cost reasoning for the project, although some minor adjustments have been made to the project framework as the activities have been elaborated, mainly related to the definition of suitable SMART indicators in the Strategic Results Framework. Two economic studies have been added to component 1, in order to support awareness raising of the economic values of riverine biodiversity and ecosystem services, and with a view to enhancing development of river-based tourism as a sustainable use option. Minor changes have been in the two component titles to more accurately reflect their emphasis, while their substantive contents remain in line with the PIF. Component 1 title was changed from:” Enabling institutional framework and capacity for managing riverine biodiversity in productive landscapes” to: “An operational institutional framework and capacity are established for strengthened management of riverine biodiversity in production landscapes”. Component 2 title was changed from “Critical riverine habitat management demonstration” to the more explicit “Best management practices for critical riverine habitats are demonstrated, enhancing biodiversity conservation status and reducing threats”. Minor adjustments have also been made to the GEF allocations for component 1 (up from \$330,000 to \$462,000) and 2 (a corresponding decrease from \$950,000 to \$815,000) following detailed design of the inputs required to achieve the intended outcomes. As a biodiversity mainstreaming project, increased

<sup>4</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

resources were considered necessary to achieve the intended capacity building, awareness raising and national policy and strategy development needed to integrate biodiversity considerations into river management at national level, while still leaving sufficient resources for the purposes of the pilot demonstration activities, which are also more strongly supported by cofinancing.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

The risks table in the project document has been updated and expanded, taking into account the findings of the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure. The revised risks table is presented below.

Identified Risks	Category	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Assessment	Elaboration of Risks	Mitigation Measures
Sectoral conflicts due to lack of coordination and collaboration impact project progress	Political	Medium	Likely	Medium	Various government agencies responsible for the management of different aspects of river basins are unwilling to coordinate and collaborate, leading to inappropriate or conflicting development in the catchment, e.g. logging, road construction, land-clearing for agriculture, etc. and undermining project progress.	The Government recognises the need for better coordination to improve riverine area management. The project will develop the inter-agency strategy to mainstream biodiversity into river management, which will be adopted by key agencies. The Strategy will include an inter-agency coordination mechanism with clear jurisdictions of concerned agencies as well as coordinated enforcement and compliance monitoring mechanisms. It will also include plans for mainstreaming riverine biodiversity management into operations of related sector agencies, private sector and communities, collaborative operational modality and a financing plan. The project will also invest in capacity development of NRE, DID and other relevant agencies at Federal and state levels to enable more effective collaboration between institutions. At the site level, collaboration will be established by: establishment of site level project coordination committees and/or riverine area management working committees that will be linked to existing state committees and mechanisms.
Local communities may be reluctant to engage in project activities and in riverine habitat management in general	Operational	Low	Moderately Likely	Low	There is a risk that local communities may not perceive any benefit from the project demonstration activities in their areas, and may be apprehensive of potential negative impacts on their	Component 2 of the project builds on aforementioned extensive baseline activities, plus stakeholder analysis and consultations with local communities at the demonstration sites during the PPG phase. Through this process, the receptivity of local stakeholders to the project has been determined and key stakeholders have been identified to lead on implementation of the project activities. Other forms of engagement will include

					livelihoods.	capacity building training, awareness raising and support for their participation in project activities. SESP consultations have taken specific account of potential negative impacts on local communities and vulnerable groups and safeguards included in the project design.
Climate change trends will increase water temperatures and the variability of rainfall, exacerbating floods and droughts and increasing pressures on riverine biodiversity	Environmental	Low	Likely	Low	Climate change impacts, such as increasing temperatures and hydrological regime changes, could affect aquatic and riparian habitats as well as water resource availability. Such changes would especially affect aquatic biodiversity, particularly during prolonged drought periods.	The project will aim to address the anticipated negative impacts of climate change by increasing the ecological resilience of river basins through enhancing forest cover in catchment areas, rehabilitating riparian forest cover, and improving water quality through an integrated river basin management approach. This approach, coupled with improved availability of information from biophysical monitoring, will provide a strengthened basis for ecosystem-based adaptation to climate change impacts.
Government staff turnover, especially trained technical staff, may affect the project negatively	Operational	Medium	Likely	Medium	Government staff with strong knowledge of biodiversity related subjects may retire or move position during the project period, weakening institutional knowledge and capacity for project implementation.	The project will support strengthening of institutional capacity of DID as the principal government agency in charge of river management. Project intervention will include review of staffing structure of DID and its enhancement. This will reduce negative impacts from possible staff turnover. A series of training sessions will be conducted strengthening knowledge and skills necessary for integrated river management. The overall advancement of this subject area provides increased opportunity and incentives for staff to remain involved.
Human rights concerns raised by stakeholders at project sites are not addressed	Operational	Low	Moderately Likely	Low	The main concerns of relevance (see SESP) are continued access to natural resources and land uses in riparian zones.	At project demonstration sites, the project has conducted stakeholder analysis and consultations regarding project aims and activities with the concerned communities. The project design includes specific stakeholder involvement mechanisms to ensure that local communities both participate and benefit from project activities. Continued access to riverine resources depends on the legality of

						existing uses, where encroachment into legal riparian buffer zones may be an issue. A consultative approach towards resolving such issues would be taken, allowing informed decisions to be taken through government led processes. The same issues apply at a wider national level, in terms of the implications of the intersectoral strategy for riverine biodiversity management, which should undergo screening for social impact assessment during its development, and include provisions to address and compensate potential social impacts arising from its implementation.
Gender equality concerns raised by stakeholders at project sites are not addressed	Operational	Low	Moderately Likely	Low	The most likely concerns (See SESP) are that the project maintains the status quo, without raising awareness of the significance of gender equality or empowering women through their engagement in the project activities	At the project demonstration sites, the project has conducted stakeholder analysis and consultations that specifically included assessment of the current roles and livelihoods activities undertaken by women in local communities. These have been taken into account in the design of the demonstration activities, in order to ensure the empowerment, engagement and delivery of benefits to women in the targeted communities. Project monitoring and evaluation specifically includes indicators and reporting on the engagement of women in project implementation.
The project negatively impacts environmental sustainability of critical habitats and protected areas	Operational	Negligible	Unlikely	Low	The potential concern (see SESP) is that the project will have negative impacts on the protected areas and critical habitats within the project area. This is considered extremely unlikely as the project is intended to achieve overwhelmingly positive impacts for biodiversity conservation.	The project is designed to enhance biodiversity conservation into river management. At such, it will result in improvements in the environmental sustainability of river basin management, enhanced riparian zone protection, improved water quality, strengthened biodiversity conservation, climate change adaptation and sustained delivery of riverine ecosystem services. No negative impacts are foreseen at either the demonstration sites or through national implementation of the inter-sectoral strategy for riverine biodiversity conservation.
Indigenous peoples dependent on	Operational	Medium	Moderately Likely	Low	Indigenous communities are present at all	This impact is essentially the same as the risk on human rights above, only in this case considered



<p>riparian resources at project sites and elsewhere in Malaysia are negatively impacted by project outcomes</p>					<p>three project demonstration sites, and in many other riverine settlements throughout the country. There is a risk (identified in the SESP) that their land uses and access to riverine resources could be negatively impacted by stronger protection of riverine biodiversity.</p>	<p>specifically for indigenous peoples, whose communities are often associated with rivers, and who traditionally rely on riverine resources to a fair degree (together with adjacent forest resources and other sources of livelihood including agriculture and outside labour). The mitigation measures are essentially the same as for Risk 1 above, but including specific consideration of the needs of indigenous peoples in stakeholder assessments and the design of project activities at demonstration sites, and social impact assessments for national plans. During project design, specific attention has been given to involving indigenous communities in activities at the demonstration sites, including ensuring that they benefit directly from activities such as appointment of river rangers, ecotourism development, support for traditional fishery management, biodiversity monitoring, and habitat rehabilitation.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

Collaboration arrangements with three further GEF projects has been identified - see Table 15 in the Stakeholder Involvement Plan in Section B1 below for details.

**B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

*PART IV: Stakeholder Involvement Plan*

The PPG phase included extensive consultations with the project’s key stakeholders at the national and local levels. Field trips were carried out between May 2014 and January 2015, during which all project sites were visited and local authorities and community organisations were presented with the project proposal for discussion (see **Annex 8** for ESSP consultation reports). Two national level stakeholder workshops were convened in Kuala Lumpur by DID Malaysia, the first on 3 November 2014 (including both national and state level participants), and a second final project document review workshop in February 2015. State level meetings were held in Ipoh, Perak on 7 July 2014 (presentation to the State River Management Committee, chaired by the State Executive Councillor); in Shah Alam, Selangor in August 2014 (convened by the Selangor State Economic Planning Unit); and in Kota Kinabalu, Sabah on 22 July (convened by the Sabah State Economic Planning Unit). In addition, a number of bilateral meetings were held, including key stakeholders who could not attend the workshops. Generally, the project design was a highly participatory process, in line with UNDP’s and GEF’s requirements.

A plan for the engagement of stakeholders is presented in this section. However, this should be reviewed and a full Stakeholder Involvement Plan should be prepared at project inception stage and this

is already an identified activity.

The key stakeholders at national level and for the demonstration sites in selected states of Malaysia, as well as those involved in relevant biodiversity conservation and river management programs were identified and their mandates and roles analyzed. **Table 1** below assesses stakeholders in terms of their influence (power over outcomes) and impact effects (how affected they will be by the project outcomes). For example, ‘high influence, low impact’ stakeholders will have a large degree of influence upon the project but will not be significantly impacted by its outcomes.

**TABLE 1. STAKEHOLDER INFLUENCE ON THE PROJECT AND POTENTIAL PROJECT IMPACTS**

	Low Influence	High Influence
High Impact	<p>National Environmental NGOs (e.g. GEC, MNS, WWF-Malaysia, WildAsia, Wetlands International - Malaysia, etc)</p> <p>National Social NGOs (e.g. Eco-Melawati, COAC, JOAS, PACOS)</p> <p>Local Community Organisations (Village Development and Security Committees - JKKK)</p>	<p>Ministry of Natural Resources &amp; Environment</p> <p>Ministry of Plantation Industries &amp; Commodities</p> <p>Drainage &amp; Irrigation Department</p> <p>Department of Wildlife and National Parks (State level)</p> <p>Department of Fisheries</p> <p>Department of Forestry</p> <p>Department of Environment</p> <p>State Government (Executive Council)</p> <p>Land Owners &amp; Licence/Concession Holders</p> <p>Local Authorities (District Councils)</p>
Low Impact	<p>International NGOs</p> <p>Universities</p>	<p>Ministry of Housing &amp; Local Government</p> <p>National Land Council</p> <p>National Physical Planning Council</p> <p>Media</p> <p>Donors</p>

The PPG phase included consultations with the Project’s key stakeholders at the national and local levels. Field trips were carried out to the three selected sites in Sabah, Perak and Selangor as well as the Federal Territory of Kuala Lumpur, where all project sites were visited. The project proposal was presented to local authorities and community organizations and discussed. One workshop was convened by DID Malaysia at the national level for both national and state level stakeholders, and feedback obtained on the key threats to riverine biodiversity and the proposed project intervention strategy. In addition, several bilateral meetings were held, mostly with donors and key stakeholders who could not attend the workshops. Several meetings were held with JPS, (WP) and at least two meetings were held with stakeholders at the state levels. The consultants made at least two visits to each of the communities in the demonstration sites. Generally, project design was a highly participatory process, in line with UNDP’s and GEF’s requirements.

The stakeholders to have primary involvement in the Project are the federal government’s Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, specifically the Drainage and Irrigation Department at both the Federal and State levels, and various state level agencies such as the Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Sabah, LUAS (Selangor), and the Perak Exco on Water Management. Steered by the NRE and DID at the Federal level government, state governments of Sabah, Perak, and Selangor will play an important role in the Project, being the primary institutions for the enabling and implementation of the Project, including the sustainable riverine biodiversity management plans, the financing mechanisms and riverine biodiversity conservation activities.

See **Table 2** below for a list of the Project’s key stakeholders, and further information in **Table 1** in the Stakeholder Analysis section above. Details of the roles and responsibilities of local level stakeholders at the project demonstration sites is given in **Table 3**.

**TABLE 2. KEY STAKEHOLDERS OF THE PROJECT**

<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>Current Roles and Responsibilities</b>	<b>Interests in Project</b>	<b>Potential Conflict and Mitigation</b>
The Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment: the National Executing Agency	Ultimate responsibility for ensuring successful completion of the Project.	National executing agency  Major beneficiary of capacity building  Benefit to key line agencies: DID, DWNP, DoE, FDPM.	As the National Executing Agency, there should be no potential conflict
Department of Irrigation and Drainage	Key coordinating agency working with NRE. Main technical scope maintenance and monitoring of inland water bodies	Along with NRE, will act as the National executing agency  Major beneficiary of capacity building  Benefit to key line agencies: DID.	Seeks to maintain integrity of water courses; however, may disagree with certain activities planned as part of sustainable landscape management  Mitigation: involve in project from an early stage

Department of Environment	Responsible for approving EIAs and monitoring implementation of mitigating measures	Will need to adapt EIA completion procedure so that development projects are not approved before EIA review. Will provide advice for formulating guidelines for EIA and AMMO integration in landscape management planning	Seeks to control of environmental impacts of development projects; however, may object to request to adapt EIA procedure  Mitigation: (1) involve in project from an early stage; (2) involve senior NRE officer as chair of PSC
Department of Wildlife and National Parks	Key implementing partner: will support DID in oversight and coordination of riverine management and project implementation, particularly concerned with river management, protected area gazettement, the implementation of wildlife crime law enforcement measures, human-wildlife conflict prevention, ecotourism and sustainable handicrafts activities.	Capacity building of enforcement	As the Principle Implementing Partner, there should be no potential conflict
NRE Legal Division	Will continue to manage prosecutions under the NRE, in coordination with DID, Fisheries Department, FDPM and DWNP for improved prosecution procedures	Capacity building and enhanced coordination with the enforcement agencies	May not support being given training in wildlife crime prosecution / conviction procedures  Mitigation: PSC to be chaired by senior NRE officer in a position of influence
Federal Economic Planning Unit	Responsible for decision-making regarding budgetary allocations for riverine management; will also be involved in formulation of sustainable financing plans	Enhanced capacity with regards to implementation of PES schemes in Malaysia	Seeks to encourage and plan for economic development of Malaysia; however, will need to adapt current budgetary plans in order to increase allocation of funds towards riverine biodiversity conservation

State Executive Councils	Ultimately responsible for decision-making in all land/ water matters in the focal landscapes	<p>Preservation of biodiversity in the respective states</p> <p>Enhanced PES revenue capacity</p> <p>Ecotourism &amp; handicraft schemes of benefit to the state.</p>	<p>May not support land-use decision-making informed by biodiversity, ecosystem and river management and valuation tools</p> <p>Mitigation: representatives of the offices of the key State Executive Council members will be briefed on the benefits of adopting the said approach</p>
State Economic Planning Units	Will play a key part in formulating landscape/river management plans and sustainable financing plans	Capacity building related to implementation of river management strategy	<p>May not support such a focus on conserving natural resources rather than economic development</p> <p>Mitigation: project will engage with State Executive Council members and highlight the benefits of conservation</p>
State Wildlife Departments	Responsible for wildlife policy implementation in the focal landscapes; will be involved in wildlife crime monitoring and law enforcement, and biodiversity monitoring activities	Capacity building related to implementation of river management particularly on improved aquatic crime enforcement	<p>May not support adaptations to current wildlife crime management methods</p> <p>Mitigation: project executants will include senior DWNP staff in each focal state</p>
Department of Town and Country Planning	Responsible for supporting development of local landscape plans within each state through technical advice	Plan for river management	Some local plans are already in place as part of ROL or other river management plans
Department of Orang Asli Development (JAKOA)	Key role in coordinating development activities related to the Orang Asli	Providing guidance on socio-economic development considerations as well as traditional values	Seeks to further the socio-economic development of the Orang Asli; may object to advice given regarding the unsustainability of some current income-generating

			<p>activities</p> <p>Mitigation: will be involved in the project from an early stage</p>
Environmental CSOs	<p>Global Environment Centre have a long history of collaboration with DID and other partners on their RiverCare programme, and a presence at all three of the demonstration sites.</p> <p>WWF Malaysia have an active programme advocating the strengthening of the protected area network in Sabah. Have projects working with communities in Kinabatangan river. Involved in tree planting along riparian zone in the Segama area.</p> <p>Malaysian Nature Society have active branches throughout the peninsula, including Perak, and have actively worked with indigenous communities in Perak towards conservation (with SEMAI in Ulu Geroh, Perak)</p>	<p>A key implementing organization and champion of riverine biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>Local and national CSOs are important stakeholders / collaborators and possible co-implementers of river biodiversity management in Sabah (WWFM), Ulu Kinta (MNS), on working with oil palm plantations (WildAsia, WWFM, Hutan), and engaging with local and indigenous communities (PACOS, COAC, etc).</p>	<p>Government agencies may be unwilling to work with NGOs due to issues of confidentiality of information or differences in institutional culture.</p> <p>Mitigation: project will enhance avenues for cooperation between government and civil society to increase trust and develop public- private partnerships</p>
Academic Institutions	<p>There are several local and international universities involved in research related to forest management, local communities and biodiversity conservation in the Peninsula and</p>	<p>Conducting management oriented scientific research and surveys. Supporting science based management is a key part of CBNRM</p>	<p>Universities programmes may not be geared towards the needs of the relevant implementing agencies.</p> <p>Mitigation: agencies and universities will be brought together from the start of the project to allow greater</p>

	Sabah  (See <b>Annex 10</b> ).		communication of needs and programs for each counterpart
--	--------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------------------------------

**TABLE 3. LOCAL LEVEL STAKEHOLDERS AT THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATION SITES**

Site	Stakeholder	Roles and Responsibilities
Selangor/WP	JKK Kg. Warisan (JKKK = Village Development and Security Committee)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Manage the ROL open classroom on river biodiversity, that was established during baseline activities.</li> <li>ii. Care takers of the Kelah fish breeding program in the Dam area.</li> <li>iii. Tour guides into the greater Tabur area.</li> </ul>
	JKK Kg Kemensah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Based on pilot experience in the Segama (Sabah), DID should replicate the appointment of auxiliary river rangers within the JKK with the responsibility of ensuring the cleanliness of the river. They can report directly to the authorities on any dumping into the river.</li> <li>ii. A unit with the JKK can be set up to manage the forest in the upper reaches of Kemensah River as a community forests.</li> <li>iii. Strengthen the chalet operators' capacity to create and manage eco-friendly practices.</li> <li>iv. To create awareness and to find alternatives for sewer among squatter residents.</li> <li>v. As auxiliary river rangers, the community can continue to monitor river quality, to monitor garbage dumping as well as work towards reintroduce native fish species into river.</li> </ul>
	Eco-Melawati	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Currently their work involves raising awareness towards conservation and river protection. They work with three of the seven public schools in the Melawati area.</li> <li>ii. Working with schools, they have demonstration sites for recycling, compost plots, and have school programs called Smart program and river ranger program.</li> <li>iii. They have a program with restaurants called Dapur Hijau or Green Kitchen which aims at educating restaurant operators on how to properly dispose of waste. They hope to create enough public awareness as to be a pressure group to ensure compliance from restaurants.</li> <li>iv. A possible role is they can be a hub connecting</li> </ul>

		<p>all the other NGOs and CBOs in the upper Klang area as part of a network working in the greater Melawati.</p> <p>v. They can play a role as consultants to other NGOs and CBOs in the area to access funding for biodiversity programs in the greater Melawati area.</p>
	JKK AU 3	<p>i. has the responsibility under ROL to manage a section of the river.</p> <p>ii. They have the administrative structure but require capacity in terms of awareness towards biodiversity rehabilitation.</p> <p>iii. Currently, the JKK works with children to create awareness as to not litter into drains or rivers.</p> <p>iv. A possible partnership between the JKK AU3 and Forest Research Institute Malaysia (FRIM) to learn on best plant options to be replanted in the riparian areas. They can also partner with the Fisheries Department to learn on best indigenous fishes to repopulate the river.</p> <p>v. To create a Tagal system and community management of riverine resources.</p>
	JPS	<p>i. To provide training, monitoring and coordination in riverine management.</p>
	MPAJ	<p>i. To provide enforcement support to local JKK.</p>
	DBKL	<p>i. To provide enforcement support to local JKK.</p>
	FRIM	<p>i. To identify, train and monitor local capacity in replanting indigenous plant species.</p>
	Fisheries Department	<p>i. Identify, train and monitor local capacity in reintroducing indigenous fish species.</p>
	Environmental CSOs (GEC, etc)	<p>i. To provide technical assistance and advisory services, environmental education and capacity building</p>
Ulu Kinta, Perak	JKK RPS Ulu Kinta	<p>i. i. Based on pilot experience in the Segama (Sabah), DID should replicate the appointment of auxiliary river rangers within the JKK with the responsibility of ensuring no illegal logging or pollution in the river area. They can report directly to the authorities on any illegal activities the river.</p> <p>ii. A unit with the JKK can be set up to manage the forest in the upper reaches of Ulu Kinta river as a community forests.</p>



		iii. Create capacity for handicraft and homestay as part of eco-tourism package.
	JAKOA	i. To provide assistances and support to local initiatives.
	DAM Manager	i. To provide assistances, accessibility and partnership with the indigenous JKK at RPS Ulu Kinta in preventing illegal land encroachment and logging within the water catchment area.
	JPS	i. As a coordinating agency.
	Fisheries Department	i. To provide enforcement support and training on rehabilitation indigenous fish population.
	Forest Department	i. To provide enforcement support on illegal logging.
	Environmental CSOs (GEC, MNS, etc)	i. To provide technical assistance and advisory services, environmental education and capacity building
Segama, Sabah	JKK Kg. Belacon	<p>i. Pilot the appointment of auxiliary river rangers within the JKK with the responsibility of monitoring illegal activities along river. They can report directly to the authorities on any sand mining or marble mining along the river.</p> <p>ii. A unit with the JKK can be set up to manage the riparian zone. Work closely with JPS to create awareness to the importance of maintaining a biodiversity rich riparian zone and document best practices which can be use for education among small holdings oil palm estates.</p>
	JKK Kg. Dagad	<p>i. The JKK worked with the Wildlife Department to develop homestay programs. However, due to security risk, the program no longer is in operation.</p> <p>ii. The JKK can work with the regional security body to ensure the lower Segama as a safe zone.</p> <p>iii. Deputize JKK and provide support for carrying out monitoring and prevention of Southern Philippine terrorists and fishermen from encroaching into the area.</p>
	Oil Palm Plantation	i. Participate in partnerships with government

	Companies (SabahMas, Hap Seng)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>resource management agencies</li> <li>ii. Participate in awareness raising and capacity building programmes</li> <li>iii. Participate in programmes for rehabilitation of riparian forest and riverine habitats, and management of key areas for biodiversity conservation</li> </ul>
	The East Malaysian Planters Association	i. Facilitate networking with oil palm smallholders, with potential for upscaling the results of this demonstration to other smallholders.
	JPS	i. To provide training, monitoring and coordination in riverine management.
	Wildlife Department	i. To provide enforcement support and training.
	Fisheries Department	i. To provide enforce authority on river biodiversity conservation.
	Eastern Sabah Security Command (ESSCOM)	i. To provide security cover and training for community partnership in ensuring the border integrity along the lower Segama estuary.
	Environmental CSOs (GEC, WWF, Hutan, SEEN, WildAsia, etc)	i. To provide technical assistance and advisory services, environmental education and capacity building
	Research institutions - Stability of Altered Forest Ecosystems (SAFE) Project <sup>5</sup> at Danum Valley (researching the effects of different widths of riparian buffer strips of forest on waterways as part of its Watersheds component)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. To provide technical advice and potential collaboration on riparian buffer strip development in demonstration activities</li> <li>iii. Participate in pilot project committee</li> </ul>

1. **Table 4** below outlines the coordination with other related GEF initiatives.

**TABLE 4. COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE PROJECT AND RELATED GEF INITIATIVES**

INITIATIVES / INTERVENTIONS	HOW COLLABORATION WITH THE PROJECT WILL BE ENSURED
UNDP/GEF Improving Connectivity in the Central	Council Approved. The project aims to increase connectivity of the Central Forest Spine for biodiversity conservation and maintaining ecosystem services. The proposed project will complement the IC-CFS Project by

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.safeproject.net/>

Forest Spine (IC-CFS)	strengthening biodiversity mainstreaming into the management of forested river catchment areas and river corridors within wider landscapes. The upper catchments of the Kinta and Klang Rivers are parts of the 5 million ha CFS, although not in the specific areas targeted for action through the CFS project. The overall elements of the CFS project which deal with sustainable forest area landscape management and development of PES schemes will be particularly complementary. This proposed project will generate the strategy, guidelines and best practices for conservation of riverine biodiversity which will be relevant to other portions of the CFS area. Close coordination will be achieved through regular contacts, updates and information exchanges between the two lead government agencies, namely the Forestry Department Peninsular Malaysia and DID that are both under the NRE, through the steering committees that will be chaired by the NRE.
UNDP/GEF National Biodiversity Planning to Support the Implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan in Malaysia	CEO Approved. Under this project, revision of the National Biological Diversity Policy which deals with the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in a holistic manner will build in biodiversity mainstreaming to support conservation efforts, to be reflected in the revised NBSAP. This project is also implemented by the same division in NRE and UNDP, thus the NSC will ensure coordination as well as direction and guidance from the top management of NRE.
UNDP/GEF Enhancing the effectiveness and financial sustainability of protected areas in Malaysia	CEO Approved and under implementation. This project aims at increasing financial resources for management of protected areas through conventional and non-conventional sources.  This project is implemented by DWNP and NSC is chaired by NRE which will allow for coordination of these 2 projects.
UNDP/GEF Biodiversity Conservation in Multiple Use Forest Landscapes in Sabah, Malaysia	Under Implementation. The objective of the project is to bring the land uses in the connecting landscape and protected areas under a common and integrated management umbrella strategy in order to mainstream biodiversity, ecosystem functions and resilience, while enabling ongoing sustainable uses, by achieving three interconnected outcomes: (1) provisioning of an enabling environment for optimized multiple use planning, financing, management and protection of forest landscapes; (2) demonstration of multiple-use forest landscape planning and management system, and (3) demonstration of innovative sustainable financing methods for multiple-use forest landscape management. The project will be executed by SFD as the representative of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Malaysia (NRE), which is acting as the Executing Entity (EE). The SFD will work in collaboration NRE and the State of Sabah Economic Planning Unit (SEPU). Coordination will therefore be achieved through NRE at national level, and SEPU at State level.

Major linkages identified with non-GEF initiatives are the links to the Living River/IS1R Programme of DID (Kinta River) and the River of Life Initiative (Klang River), both of which will contribute towards the cofinancing for this project and the project will be fully integrated in these on-going initiatives. In Sabah, the project will be linked to the implementation of the Sabah Strategy and Action Plan for Enhancing Water Quality in Selected rivers in Sabah as well as on-going work for the conservation of the lower Kinabatangan/ Segama Rivers coordinated by the Wildlife Department and Forestry

Department. Links will be made with the relevant multilateral/bilateral funded projects such as European Union supported work to facilitate Community-based REDD+ activities in the Kinabatangan River Corridor and JICA supported activities at the Lower Kinabatangan-Segama Ramsar site. Links will also be made with the on-going work of GEC's River Care Programme. Also located in the upper catchment of the Segama River, the Stability of Altered Forest Ecosystems (SAFE) Project will research the effects of different widths of riparian buffer strips of forest on waterways as part of its Watersheds component. A representative of SAFE will be included in the project's technical advisory committee.

## **Stakeholder Engagement**

The project will provide the following opportunities for long-term participation of all stakeholders, with a special emphasis on the active participation of local communities:

**Decision-making:** Through the landscape mechanisms and stakeholder groups. The establishment of these structures will follow a participatory and transparent process involving the confirmation of all stakeholders; conducting one-to-one consultations with all stakeholders; development of Terms of Reference (ToR) and ground-rules; inception meeting to agree on the constitution, ToR and ground-rules for the mechanism and its active land use planning, ecological monitoring and community development units.

**Capacity building:** At systemic, institutional and individual level – is one of the key strategic interventions of the project and will target all stakeholders that have the potential to be involved in brokering, implementing and/or monitoring management agreements related to activities in and around the reserves. The project will target especially organizations operating at the community level to enable them to actively participate in developing and implementing management agreements.

**Communication:** Will include the participatory development of an integrated communication strategy. The communication strategy will be based on the following key principles:

- providing information to all stakeholders;
- promoting dialogue between all stakeholders;
- promoting access to information.

The project will be launched by a well-publicized multi-stakeholder inception workshop. This workshop will provide an opportunity to provide all stakeholders with updated information on the project as well as a basis for further consultation during the project's implementation, and will refine and confirm the work plan. Based on the extensive list of stakeholders (mostly consulted) listed in the Stakeholder Analysis, a more specific stakeholder involvement strategy and plan can be developed at that inception stage.

## **Goal and Objectives for Stakeholder Involvement**

The social sustainability of activities and outputs is addressed through the execution of a stakeholder capacity analysis and the elaboration of a detailed collaborative management involvement strategy and plan which identifies stakeholders' interests, desired levels of involvement, capacities for participation (at different levels) and potential conflicts and, responsive mitigation measures.

## Principles for Stakeholder Participation

Based on the stakeholder analysis carried out during the PPG phase it is clear that different levels of capacity development activities will be required at the landscape level on the level of the individual PAs. The two landscapes with which the project will work are quite different in nature, composition of members and technical needs on the ground. It is therefore recommended at the generic proposal for capacity development activities will be refined and regularly updated at the level of each landscape.

Capacity needs fall overall into four main categories:

- Awareness raising and knowledge development about the biodiversity and ecosystem services of river ecosystems, their economic values and management;
- Knowledge and skills for the rehabilitation of riverine and riparian habitats and catchment areas;
- Technical knowledge and skills
- Financial support and investments

## Engagement Plan for Each Project Outcome

The project will aim to bring additional stakeholders on board for the implementation of riverine management demonstration projects. The existing national and state-level committees will be expanded to include representatives from NGOs and academic institutions at inception. The project will also look at setting up local-level committees, which can include local community reps as well as the other stakeholders. The engagement of NGOs, academic institutions and the private sector will be determined on a case-by case basis at inception and through the use of contractual services during project implementation. The final agreement of which stakeholders will be involved will come about at either inception, annual work planning or on a case by case basis in the case of procurement of contractual services for specific outputs and activities. However, the following stakeholders are indicated as likely to be involved in each component as follows:

### **Outcome 1: An operational institutional framework and capacity are established for strengthened management of riverine biodiversity in production landscapes**

This outcome will involve the main federal agencies with legal responsibility for various aspects of river and catchment management – NRE, DID, DoFM, FDPMP and DWNP, as well as key state level agencies – the State Economic Planning Units and DID, Water, Environment, Fisheries, Forestry and Wildlife Departments, as well as national environmental and social NGOs (e.g. WWF, MNS and Indigenous/Local Civil Society Groups). Academic institutions, specialists and international consultants will also be contracted by the project to assist in achieving this outcome.

### **Outcome 2. Best management practices for critical riverine habitats are demonstrated, enhancing biodiversity conservation status and reducing threats**

This outcome will involve the key stakeholders at state and local levels related to the pilot demonstration sites and activities in Perak, Selangor/WP and Sabah. These will include the State Economic Planning Units and DID, Water, Environment, Fisheries, Forestry and Wildlife Departments, as well as national and local environmental and social NGOs. Representatives of local authorities such as the relevant District Offices, as well as rural communities (including JAKOA, CBOs and representatives of the communities themselves). International and local consultants and community liaison officers will also be involved as and when necessary.

## Community Stakeholder Participation

Constraints to community participation includes lack of awareness, lack of capacity, lack of autonomy particularly on land matters and poor communication with authority agencies. It is recommended that any strategic involvement with indigenous and local communities should address community needs. Thus, we recommend a three part approach:

### 1. Immediate action

- Create employment funded by project activities (tree planting, fence building, women as community resource persons, etc.)
- Set-up CBOs and link to relevant national and regional NGOs
- Provide awareness and capacity building opportunities

### 2. Mid-Term Program

- Create sustainable income generating opportunities (eco-tourism, handicrafts, set up auxiliary rangers, etc. - note: sources of income should not be from the project budget)
- Develop integrated management plans for the demonstration areas

### 3. Long Term Program

- Community representatives on local committees for river management
- Community income sources diversified including environmentally sustainable practices

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The **global environmental benefits** that will be secured by the overall project will result from strengthened sustainable management of Malaysia's river systems and associated riverine buffer zones and catchment areas that specifically takes into account biodiversity conservation. The areas covered by major river basins include several Global 200 Ecoregions in East and West Malaysia, including tropical lowland, mangrove, peat and freshwater swamp-forests, submontane and montane forests. Malaysia's six Ramsar Sites include parts of river systems, mainly focusing on coastal and estuarine areas dominated by mangrove forests, but also an inland riverine swamp system (Tasek Bera). Globally threatened species occurring in the project demonstration sites' riparian areas include Tiger (EN), Malayan Tapir (EN), Sun Bear (V), Asian Elephant (EN), Bornean Pygmy Elephant (EN), Bornean Orang-utan (EN) and Proboscis Monkey (EN). A wide variety of rare and endemic fish occur including Kelah (*Tor tambroides*), Temoleh (*Probarbus jullieni*) (EN), Giant Freshwater Whip Ray (*Himantura polylepis*) and the endemic Borneo River Shark (*Glyphis fowlerae*). Reptile and amphibian species occurring in riverine habitats include the Estuarine Crocodile, False Gharial (V), turtles such as the Southeast Asian narrow-headed softshell turtle (CR), Three-striped Batagur (CR), Malaysian giant turtle (EN), and amphibians such as the Giant Asian River Frog (NT).

The improved likelihood of ecosystem conservation through more integrated river management that proactively seeks to conserve biodiversity will help to secure the socio-economic benefits provided by

ecosystem services, to the advantage of local communities who are often most dependent upon NTFPs and aquatic resources, and who will also benefit from ecosystem-based adaptation (such as hydrological buffering from highland forests). As women among the local communities are more often engaged with gathering natural resources and collecting water, they are the primary beneficiaries of sustainable and quality supply of these resources. National level benefits will accrue through ecosystem services underpinning the national economy (such as hydrological regulating services, water purification and soil protection, for example), and global environmental benefits will include carbon sequestration and maintenance of globally significant biodiversity. While systematic information is lacking on this at the national level, a number of economic valuation studies have been conducted for different ecosystems, services and uses in Malaysia (see examples below<sup>6</sup>).

At local level, the economic benefits derived from riverine resources have changed over the last few decades owing to social, economic and environmental changes. For indigenous communities along the Ulu Kinta and both indigenous and local communities in the upper reaches of the Klang river area including Kemensah, the river is no longer a primary source of goods for consumption (i.e. fish and drinking water), but it does support economic activities such as ecotourism services and fishponds. See **Annexes 3 and 8** for further information. In Ulu Kinta, the Orang Asli get their water from a gravitational system and have latrines. They also work in different sectors, no longer relying on the river to provide for subsistence or as a source for commercial enterprise, although there is potential for ecotourism development. In the upper reaches of the Klang, such as in Kemensah, the river is an important resource for commercial activity, especially fish rearing in ponds situated along the river course, and widespread small-scale eco-tourism (chalets and services for day trippers, and angling in ponds) which is heavily reliant on continuing natural and clean conditions of the river and waterfalls. Other services derived by the Orang Asli include exploiting the catchment forest for NTFPs as well as for cultivating their orchards (especially for durians).

Along the Segama river, particularly in the lower reaches, the river remains an important part of the village economy. Many continue to work as fishermen practicing small-scale fisheries. There are also thriving cottage industries that relate to the fisheries economy, such as making crab and prawn traps. In the middle reaches of the Segama, commercial activities such as sand mining from the river are practised. Also, communities open up areas along the riparian zone for smallholder oil palm plantations. There is some fishing, mostly for subsistence. Most residents however, buy their fish and other marine produce from the market. With development, there appears to be declining dependency on the river for subsistence needs.

---

<sup>6</sup>Kumari, K. 1995. An environmental and economic assessment of forest management options: A case study in Malaysia. The World Bank. *Environment Department paper No. 026*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Tan-Soo, J.S. 2010. Economic valuation of flood mitigation services provided by tropical forests in Malaysia. MS project, Duke University.

UNEP. 2007. *Guidelines for Conducting Economic Valuation of Coastal Ecosystem Goods and Services*. UNEP/GEF/SCS Technical Publication No. 8. <http://www.unepscs.org/remository/startdown/1958.html>

UNEP, 2007. Procedure for Determination of National and Regional Economic Values for Ecotone Goods and Services, and Total Economic Values of Coastal Habitats in the context of the UNEP/GEF Project Entitled: "Reversing Environmental Degradation Trends in the South China Sea and Gulf of Thailand". South China Sea Knowledge Document No. 3. UNEP/GEF/SCS/Inf.3

DiRocco, T.L. 2012. A thorough quantification of tropical forest carbon stocks in Malaysia. Carbon Stocks of Tropical Forests. Univ California, Berkeley Environmental Sciences 2012. 18pp. [http://nature.berkeley.edu/classes/es196/projects/2012final/DiRoccoT\\_2012.pdf](http://nature.berkeley.edu/classes/es196/projects/2012final/DiRoccoT_2012.pdf)

Women have unique ways of producing and transmitting knowledge, but face barriers to participating in decision-making processes, both traditional and contemporary, that favor men in positions of power. For instance, the importance of gender and the essential role of women in developing and using community protocols (one of the demonstration project themes) have long been considered<sup>7</sup>. Key lessons that will be integrated into this project include providing spaces for separate meetings and trainings with women to build their technical skills and capacities, supporting female champions and facilitators to complement (not threaten) traditional leadership, and using the strengths of customary laws (e.g. social norms of honor, pride, and reciprocity) as the basis for culturally appropriate and representative decision-making processes both within communities and in multi-stakeholder settings. For the rural communities in Sabah and Perak, special attention will be given to develop spaces for women's participation. For the urban landscape of the Klang River basin, particularly in JKK AU3 and Eco-Melawati, women have started to play a role in educating children against littering in the river and on the organization as a whole. In Kg. Kemensah, women are active as traders supporting the chalet operations. These women often open restaurants or food kiosks next to the river. However, there appears to be a gap in their voice as men who operate the chalets represent the group as a whole. Working closely with both men and women in this sector, the project aims to address the challenge of unregulated eco-tourism development along the Kemensah river and to develop and socialize guidelines for more sustainable use of the river. Women participate in the Eco-Melawati CBO, playing an important role in the organization.

The pilot projects will work closely with community facilitators, community-based organizations, and NGOs to ensure that the partner communities are integrally involved in all aspects of the project and in locally appropriate ways. This will include, among other things, regular meetings and discussions (in-person, phone, email), group reflection and revision of the project to date, focused workshops and peer training sessions (including community reporting, monitoring, and consolidation workshops), and support for community outreach and communication tools. Community organizations will be encouraged to register themselves with the Registrar of Societies (ROS) to facilitate formal relationships between community and government. These are part of the efforts and initiatives of Malaysia towards achieving the CBD's Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Communities' roles in the project implementation and their capacity needs for fulfilling the roles were assessed through an extensive consultation process.

For a community to participate, they must feel they have a stake and they must see benefits from the project. Hence, the project will facilitate the creation of employment opportunities such as auxiliary river rangers as a means of involving the indigenous and local communities in protection of the riverine areas. Developing local enforcement and monitoring capacity addresses two issues; firstly, the lack of manpower from enforcement agencies, and secondly, to help develop a sense of ownership among the communities themselves. The auxiliary rangers will work closely with JPS, Local Municipal authorities, Fisheries Department, Wildlife Department and Forestry Department.

The project will work to develop local capacities that can be advantageous depending on the landscape. In the Ulu Kinta, Kemensah and Segama there are indigenous groups with some capacity to produce handicrafts, and who can act as tour guide operators and homestay operators. However, there are not many, and opportunities to develop their programs have been limited. They will, however, be supported to participate in: monitoring and enforcement, tree-planting and fence construction, documentation of local resource sites and local knowledge. The capacity required includes: access and benefit sharing mechanism needs to be

---

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, Köhler-Rollefson, I., 2012. *Invisible Guardians – Women manage livestock diversity*. FAO Animal Production and Health Paper No. 174. FAO: Rome, Italy; Shrumm, H., and H. Jonas, 2011. *Asia Regional Initiative on Biocultural Community Protocols: Inception Meeting Report(2-4 April, 2011: Digana, Sri Lanka)*. Natural Justice: Malaysia/India.



developed, buy-in from government agencies for employment in suitable roles, and training in documentation processes, curating and archiving.

### B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The lack of a national framework and adequate capacity for riverine biodiversity conservation are significant barriers impeding the development of a sustainable management regime to maintain the biological resources, environmental quality and ecosystem services provided by Malaysia's river systems. These barriers negatively affect conservation efforts, as the full value of Malaysia's bio-diverse river systems together with the associated catchment forests, wetlands and coastal ecosystems cannot be realized and sectoral land uses such as plantation development take priority over the maintenance of biodiversity and ecosystem services. The project's intervention aims to remove these barriers, allowing environmentally sustainable industries such as bio-prospecting, tourism and recreation, water supply, and local livelihoods to develop, providing benefits to the state, commercial sector and ILCs, while maintaining environmental quality and ecological security.

The project takes the approach of addressing barriers to the achievement of effective biodiversity conservation for Malaysia's riverine environment, characterized as a sub-optimal policy and institutional framework and capacity for riverine biodiversity management, and the absence of successfully demonstrated experiences in integrated river management. This approach is cost-effective in that it will have broad applicability at state and national levels, with impacts throughout the 150 major river systems across Malaysia in the long term. As such, the project contributes directly towards national policy, regulatory, fiscal, data management and communications goals in support of biodiversity conservation and an effectively managed river system.

The project strategy also focuses on demonstrating best practices for riverine biodiversity conservation in specific landscapes and documenting these, as well as others from experience elsewhere in Malaysia (on the Kinabatangan River for example) for replication and upscaling in order to extend their impact and raise overall standards through capacity building and systematization, which is highly cost-effective and low risk. The project's second component aims to build support for biodiversity conservation in the target landscapes through building partnerships across multiple sectors (involving government, CSOs, private sector and other stakeholders) for more effective implementation of river biodiversity conservation, building on some useful baseline experience.

At a technical level, the streamlining of progressive approaches into key agencies for river management for application across the country for watershed management, riparian buffer zone rehabilitation, pollution control, community engagement, biophysical monitoring and information management will be a cost-effective investment in terms of project impact.

The project's development of an inter-agency strategy for riverine biodiversity conservation, with an associated action plan and financing plan will secure the government resources needed to initiate the implementation of the strategy, including associated ongoing capacity development. In addition, the development of public-private partnerships will support biodiversity-friendly land uses in riparian zones and catchment areas and reduce key threats to wildlife, enabling the application of financing from the private sector and CSO operational sources to complement government support. Collectively, these

approaches will secure and extend financing for riverine biodiversity conservation beyond existing levels.

The total GEF investment of US\$1,404,000 for this project will leverage a minimum of US\$7.5 million in cofinancing, a highly cost-effective ratio of 5.34 with additional associated financing inputs anticipated during project implementation. The overall GEF investment in strengthening biodiversity conservation for an estimated 3.9 million ha of river and associated wetland habitats nationally in the long term will average around US\$ 0.36 per hectare per year, a small fraction of the estimated value of the ecosystem services provided.

Finally, the recognition associated with involvement in an international project and receipt of GEF resources channeled through a UN implementing agency is a source of pride for national, state and local project partners, which can provide a much strengthened position in addressing critical threats to key biodiversity areas such as catchment forest conversion, mining, channelization of rivers, and hydro-electric schemes. The increased awareness, capacity and improved communications between different government sectors that the project will also enable will facilitate the political commitment to take difficult decisions on issues such as expanding the representation of river habitats in the protected area system, strengthening of regulations and enforcement to control riparian development, and the adoption of more environmentally friendly practices in related sectors. These all represent significant cost-effective project impacts.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:**

#### *PART IV: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget* **Monitoring and reporting<sup>8</sup>**

Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures and will be provided by the project team and the UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) with support from the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit in Bangkok. The Strategic Results Framework in Section II Part I provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The M&E plan includes: inception report, project implementation reviews, quarterly and annual review reports, and mid-term review and final evaluation. The following sections outline the principal components of the M&E Plan and indicative cost estimates related to M&E activities (see **Table 5** below). The project's M&E Plan will be presented and finalized in the Project's Inception Report following a collective fine-tuning of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities.

136. A Project Inception Workshop will be conducted with the full project team, relevant government counterparts, co-financing partners, the UNDP-CO and representation from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit, as well as UNDP-GEF (HQs) as appropriate. A fundamental objective of the Inception Workshop will be to assist the project team to understand and take ownership of the project's goal and objective, as well as finalize preparation of the project's first Annual Work Plan (AWP) and annual and quarterly activity plans on the basis of the Strategic Results Framework (SRF). This will include reviewing the

---

<sup>8</sup> As per GEF guidelines, the project will also be using the BD 1 Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). New or additional GEF monitoring requirements will be accommodated and adhered to once they are officially launched.

SRF (indicators, means of verification, assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise, finalizing the Biennial Work Plan (BWP) with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project.

A detailed schedule of project review meetings will be developed by the project management, in consultation with project implementation partners and stakeholder representatives and incorporated in the Project Inception Report. Day-to-day monitoring of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the Project Manager based on the project's BWP, activity plans and its indicators. Specific targets for the first year implementation progress indicators together with their means of verification will be developed at the Inception Workshop and included in the BWP. Targets and indicators for subsequent years would be defined annually as part of the internal evaluation and planning processes undertaken by the project team.

Measurement of impact indicators related to riverine biodiversity conservation targets will occur according to the schedules defined in the Inception Workshop. The measurement of these will be undertaken by the project partners, or through subcontracts or retainers with relevant institutions. Periodic monitoring of implementation progress will be undertaken by the UNDP-CO through quarterly meetings with the Implementing Partner, or more frequently as deemed necessary. This will allow parties to take stock and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure smooth implementation of project activities.

Annual Monitoring will occur through the NSC Meetings (NSCM). This is the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. The project will be subject to NSCMs at least two times a year. The first such meeting will be held within the first six months of the start of full implementation.

The Project Manager in consultations with UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU will prepare a UNDP/GEF PIR during the months of June-August. In addition, the Project Manager, in consultation with UNDP-CO will prepare an Annual Review Report (ARR) by the end of January and submit it to NSC members at least two weeks prior to the NSCM for review and comments. The ARR will be used as one of the basic documents for discussions in the NSCM. The Project Manager will present the ARR (and if needed the PIR) to the NSC, highlighting policy issues and recommendations for the decision of the NSCM participants. The Project Manager also informs the participants of any agreement reached by stakeholders during the PIR/ARR preparation on how to resolve operational issues. Separate reviews of each project component may also be conducted if necessary. The NSC has the authority to suspend disbursement if project performance benchmarks are not met. Benchmarks will be developed at the Inception Workshop, based on delivery rates, and qualitative assessments of achievements of outputs.

The terminal NSCM is held in the last month of project operations. The Project Manager is responsible for preparing the Terminal Report and submitting it to UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU. It shall be prepared in draft at least two months in advance of the terminal NSCM in order to allow review, and will serve as the basis for discussions in the NSCM. The terminal meeting considers the implementation of the project as a whole, paying particular attention to whether the project has achieved its stated objectives and contributed to the broader environmental objective. It decides whether any actions are still necessary, particularly in relation to sustainability of project results, and acts as a vehicle through which lessons learnt can be captured to feed into other projects.

UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF RCU as appropriate, will conduct yearly visits to project sites based on an agreed upon schedule to be detailed in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Any other member of the National Steering Committee can also accompany.

## Reporting

The Project Manager will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports that form part of the monitoring process. A Project Inception Report will be prepared immediately following the Inception Workshop. It will include a detailed Annual Work Plan divided in quarterly time-frames detailing the activities and progress indicators that will guide implementation during the first year of the project. An Annual Review Report (ARR) shall be prepared by the Project Manager and shared with the National Steering Committee. As minimum requirement, the ARR shall consist of the Atlas standard format for the Project Progress Report (PPR) covering the whole year with updated information for each element of the PPR as well as a summary of results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the project level. The ARR should consist of the following sections: (i) project risks and issues; (ii) project progress against pre-defined indicators and targets and (iii) outcome performance. The Project Implementation Review (PIR) is an annual monitoring process mandated by the GEF. Once the project has been under implementation for a year (from the CEO approval date), a Project Implementation Report must be completed by the CO together with the project team. Quarterly progress reports: Short reports outlining main updates in project progress will be provided quarterly to the local UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF RCU by the project team. UNDP ATLAS Monitoring Reports: A Combined Delivery Report (CDR) summarizing all project expenditures, is mandatory and should be issued quarterly following the finalization of the quarterly progress reports. The following logs should be prepared: (i) The Issues Log is used to capture and track the status of all project issues throughout the implementation of the project. (ii) the Risk Log is maintained throughout the project to capture potential risks to the project and associated measures to manage risks; and (iii) the Lessons Learned Log is maintained throughout the project to capture insights and lessons based on good and bad experiences and behaviours. Project Terminal Report: During the last three months of the project the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. Periodic Thematic Reports: As and when called for by UNDP, UNDP-GEF or the Implementing Partner, the project team will prepare Specific Thematic Reports, focusing on specific issues or areas of activity. Technical Reports are detailed documents covering specific areas of analysis or scientific specializations within the overall project. As part of the Inception Report, the project team will prepare a draft Reports List, detailing the technical reports that are expected to be prepared on key areas of activity during the course of the Project, and tentative due dates. Where necessary this Reports List will be revised and updated, and included in subsequent APRs.

## External Evaluations

The project will be subjected to at least one independent external review and one evaluation: An independent Mid-Term Review will be undertaken at the mid-point of the project lifetime. The Mid-Term Review will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Furthermore, it will review and update the ESSP report. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term review will be decided after

consultation between the parties to the project document. The ToR for this Mid-term review will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit.

An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the terminal NSC meeting, and will focus on the same issues as the mid-term review. The final evaluation will also look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. The Final Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities. The ToR for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit.

### Learning and Knowledge Sharing

The project will develop a communications strategy in the first year, which will be updated annually and implementation supported by a communications, education and awareness specialist. This will include capturing and disseminating lessons learned, for review at NSC meetings in order to inform the direction and management of the project, and shared with project stakeholders as appropriate. A project completion report will document the project’s achievements and lessons learned at the end of the project. Results from the project will also be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through a number of existing information sharing networks and forums.

### Branding and Visibility

Full compliance is required with UNDP’s Branding Guidelines and guidance on the use of the UNDP logo. These can be accessed at <http://web.undp.org/comtoolkit/reaching-the-outside-world/outside-world-core-concepts-visual.shtml>. Full compliance is also required with the GEF Branding Guidelines and guidance on the use of the GEF logo. These can be accessed at [http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF\\_logo](http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo). The UNDP and GEF logos should be the same size. When both logs appear on a publication, the UNDP logo should be on the left top corner and the GEF logo on the right top corner. Further details are available from the UNDP-GEF team based in the region.

### Audit Clause

The Government will provide the Resident Representative with certified periodic financial statements, and with an annual audit of the financial statements relating to the status of UNDP (including GEF) funds according to the established procedures set out in the Programming and Finance manuals. The Audit will be conducted according to UNDP financial regulations, rules and audit policies by the legally recognized auditor of the Government, or by a commercial auditor engaged by the Government.

**TABLE 5. M&E ACTIVITIES, RESPONSIBILITIES, BUDGET AND TIME FRAME**

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame

Inception Workshop	Project Manager UNDP CO UNDP GEF	10,000	Within first three months of project start up
Inception Report	Project Team UNDP CO	None	Submit draft two weeks before the IW, finalize it immediately following IW
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators	Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop. Indicative cost: 20,000.	Start, mid and end of project
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance-measured annually	Oversight by Project Manager Project team	None	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR and PIR	Project Team UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF	None	Annually
Quarterly progress reports	Project team	None	Quarterly
CDRs	Project Manager	None	Quarterly
Issues Log	Project Manager UNDP CO Programme Staff	None	Quarterly
Risks Log	Project Manager UNDP CO Programme Staff	None	Quarterly
Lessons Learned Log	Project Manager UNDP CO Programme Staff	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Review, including SESP review	Project team UNDP- CO UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit External Consultants (i.e. review team)	40,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	Project team,	40,000	At the end of project implementation

	UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)		
Terminal Report	Project team UNDP-CO local consultant	0	At least one month before the end of the project
Lessons learned	Project team UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit (suggested formats for documenting best practices, etc)	9,000	Compilation, publication and dissemination of lessons learned at end of project
Audit	UNDP-CO Project team	10,000	Yearly
TOTAL indicative COST <i>Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses</i>		US\$ 129,000	


**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Dr. Lian Kok Fei  GEF Operational Focal Point	Undersecretary, Environmental Management and Climate Change Division	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	01/22/2014

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator.		05/25/2015	Midori Paxton, Regional Technical Advisor, EBD, UNDP	+66- 988247330	midori.paxton@ undp.org



**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

*PART I: Strategic Results Framework, SRF (formerly GEF Logical Framework) Analysis*

<b>Objective/ Outcome</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>End of Project target</b>	<b>Source of Information</b>	<b>Risks and assumptions</b>
<b>Objective:</b> To mainstream biodiversity conservation into riverine landscapes through improved river planning and management practices in Malaysia	Riverine biodiversity conservation is mainstreamed into river management policies, regulations and plans involving related sectors, as indicated in the GEF Biodiversity 2 Tracking Tool (see <b>Annex 6</b> )	See the GEF BD Tracking Tool ( <b>Annex 6</b> )  Existing national and state policies, regulations and plans do not adequately cover riverine biodiversity conservation, with responsibilities fragmented between agencies and low priority given to the subject.	See the GEF BD Tracking Tool ( <b>Annex 6</b> )  Integrated approach to riverine biodiversity conservation reflected in inter-agency strategy and action plan, and related policies and plans for river management	GEF BD2 Tracking Tool completed at project preparation stage, midterm and project completion.	<b>Risks:</b> Sectoral conflicts due to lack of coordination and collaboration impact project progress <u>Assumption:</u> Malaysia's federal and state governments are committed to the conservation and sustainable use of the country's riverine biodiversity resources and the introduction of a national framework for inter-sectoral collaboration
<b>Outcome 1:</b> An operational institutional framework and	<b>Outputs:</b> 1.1 Inter-agency strategy, national action plan and financing plan to mainstream biodiversity into river management developed and adopted 1.2 Best Management Practice guidelines developed and adopted 1.3 Institutional capacity of NRE, DID and other related Federal and state agencies and key non-governmental stakeholders enhanced for riverine biodiversity management 1.4 Awareness programmes delivered targeting policy makers and practitioners				

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
capacity are established for strengthened management of riverine biodiversity in production landscapes	1.1 Development of a formalized mechanism for inter-agency collaboration to mainstream biodiversity into river management	No formalized mechanisms exist at national level for inter-agency collaboration on riverine biodiversity management	Inter-agency Strategy to mainstream biodiversity into river management developed and adopted including: (i) an interagency coordination mechanism with clear jurisdictions of concerned agencies; (ii) coordinated enforcement and compliance monitoring mechanisms; (iii) plans for mainstreaming riverine biodiversity management into operations of related sector agencies, private sector and communities; (iv) collaborative operational modality; (v) National Action Plan; and (vi) Financing Plan.	Inter-agency Strategy, Action Plan and Financing Plan endorsed by NRE	<u>Risks:</u> Sectoral conflicts due to lack of coordination and collaboration impact project progress Government staff turnover, especially trained technical staff, may affect the project negatively <u>Assumption:</u> Federal and state government support exists for introduction of a national framework for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into river management
	1.2 Availability of Best Management Practice (BMP) guidelines that systematically address the management of riverine biodiversity in the Malaysian context	BMP guidelines available on some relevant topics but not comprehensive or easily accessible; Lack of economic information on riverine ecosystem services including tourism to underpin policy and planning	(i)Best Management Practice (BMP) guidelines for management of riverine biodiversity developed, adopted and made widely available for application by NRE and DID; (ii)Riverine biodiversity valuation study report (iii)Riverine biodiversity-based tourism study report	BMP Guidelines for riverine biodiversity management endorsed by NRE; reports on economic valuation study and tourism study.	

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	1.3 Federal government budget allocated for implementation of riverine biodiversity management strategy and action plan including establishment of a Biodiversity /ecosystem unit within DID	No specific allocation for riverine biodiversity management; no dedicated staff within DID for riverine biodiversity management	(i)At least USD 1 million per annum allocated for implementation of the riverine biodiversity management strategy and action plan; (ii)A Biodiversity /Ecosystem Unit is established within DID, complete with its roles and responsibilities, organization chart, 4 staff, and annual budget.	NRE and DID annual budget / financing reports; Civil Service Department approval for new Biodiversity / ecosystem unit within DID including staffing needs	
	1.4 Improved capacities of key national agencies responsible riverine biodiversity conservation as shown by an increase in the Riverine Biodiversity Capacity Development Scorecard (see <b>Annex 4</b> )	Baseline score of 17% (Nov 2014)	Target score of 50% by end of project Biodiversity/ecosystem unit established within DID and riverine biodiversity valuation and other tools are in place.	Capacity development scorecard assessments at mid-term and project completion	
	1.5 Percentage of key agency staff and other national and state level stakeholders targeted by the campaign whose knowledge, attitudes and practices change in relation to riverine biodiversity and ecosystem services, the approach needed for a holistic and integrated approach for effective river management, and the responsibilities of different stakeholders. See <b>Annex 5</b> for methodology.	Baseline to be determined at outset of specific awareness activities	60% of targeted stakeholders	-Results of structured interviews and /or questionnaires at start of awareness campaign (baseline) and repeated at project completion. -Documented expressions of support	
<b>Outcome 2.</b> Best management practices for critical	<b>Outputs:</b> 2.1 Biodiversity management strengthened and habitat enhanced through improved water reservoir catchment management in Upper Kinta River Basin (Perak) 2.2 Riverine biodiversity and habitat management integrated into planning and implementation of urban river management programmes in the Klang River Basin (Selangor and Federal Territory)				

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
riverine habitats are demonstrated, enhancing biodiversity conservation status and reducing threats	2.3 Riparian habitat protected and enhanced in partnership with the private sector and local communities in the Segama River Basin (Sabah)				
	2.1 Pilot demonstration 1 in upper Kinta Basin improves status of riverine biodiversity through strengthened watershed management, indicated by: (i)percentage of cleared / eroding slopes in the upper catchment area that have been effectively treated. (ii)reduced rates and eventual phasing out of land clearing for orchards in traditional orang asli lands in the dam catchment (iii) mainstreamed approach applied in implementing catchment management plan (CMP), with inter-agency task forces tackling specific problems and all stakeholders engaged in CMP implementation. (iv)improved local status of selected globally significant species such as Copper Mahseer <i>Neolissochilus hexagonolepis</i>	(i)2013 Baseline – are of eroding/cleared slopes to be established using GIS in Year 1 (ii)low level of forest clearance for orchards in traditional lands (<5ha/year) (iii)Lack of mainstreamed approach has resulted in major localised degradation of catchment with significant negative impacts on riverine biodiversity (iv)Copper Mahseer present in parts of the Kinta river system but impacted by high sediment loading from land clearance and slope erosion	(i)at least 75% of cleared/eroding slopes in the upper catchment area effectively treated (ii) reduced level of forest clearance for orchards in traditional lands (<1ha / year) (iii) mainstreamed approach applied in implementing CMP, with inter-agency task forces tackling specific problems and all stakeholders engaged in catchment management plan implementation. (iv)Copper Mahseer present in all tributaries of the river system above the Sultan Azlan Shah dam	(i)GIS mapping of area and status of cleared/eroding slopes in catchment  (ii)GIS mapping of forest cover and land uses in the catchment; Perak Forestry Dept.  (iii)Project reports, participating government agency reports	<u>Risks:</u>  Local communities may be reluctant to engage in project activities and in riverine habitat management in general  Government staff turnover, especially trained technical staff, may affect the project negatively  Climate change trends will increase water temperatures and the variability of rainfall, exacerbating floods and droughts and increasing pressures on riverine biodiversity  <u>Assumption:</u> State government support exists for riverine biodiversity conservation and the engagement of other stakeholders
	2.2 Riverine biodiversity management integrated into planning and implementation of the Klang River of Life Programme, indicated by: (i)adoption of river stretches by local stakeholders through partnership agreements with responsible authorities, (ii)physical enhancement of riverine and riparian habitats in the River of Life (ROL) are of the upper Klang River benefiting riverine biodiversity such as globally threatened Kelah <i>Tor tambroides</i>	(i)Local stakeholders involved in GEC / DID River Care programme, but <b>limited</b> formal adoption of river stretches; (ii)Nearly all changes in riverine habitats involve habitat loss and degradation, declining populations of species such as <i>Tor</i>	(i) Cover whole ROL area, influence engineering practices on 20km (c.100ha) of that area...Adoption of at least 4km (c.40 ha) of river stretches by local stakeholders through partnership agreements with responsible authorities; (ii) Engineering practices are influenced	(i)Stakeholder agreements for adoption of river stretches (DID / Project reports)  (ii)Project reports	

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
	(iii)awareness levels concerning the risks posed by aquatic alien invasive species (AIS)	<i>tambroides</i> ; (iii)Very low awareness of the risks posed by aquatic AIS among key stakeholder groups including aquarium and aquaculture industries (baseline to be conducted in Y1, See <b>Annex 5</b> for methods)	over at least 20km of river within ROL area and riverine and riparian habitats are rehabilitated to semi-natural condition in at least 4 locations (c.10 ha) in the upper Klang River system benefiting riverine biodiversity including sustained presence of <i>Tor tambroides</i> in specific locations; (iii)60% awareness of AIS risks among targeted aquarium and aquaculture industries within the target areas	(iii)Project reports-see methods in <b>Annex 5</b> .	
	2.3: Riparian habitat protected and enhanced in partnership with the private sector and local communities in the Segama river basin, indicated by: (i) Length of biodiversity rich riparian zone protected through public-private-community partnerships along the Segama River in Sabah (ii) Engagement of local communities in river monitoring and protection (iii)Riverine biodiversity monitoring capacity developed and protocols established for implementation (iv)Increase in local extent of riparian distribution of key species such as <i>Pongo pygmaeus</i> , <i>Nasalis larvatus</i> and <i>Presbytis cristata</i>	(i)c.40km of riparian zone rehabilitated by SabahMas by Dec 2014. (ii)Local communities not currently engaged in river monitoring or protection (iii)No systematic riverine biodiversity monitoring in place (iv)Baseline information on riparian distribution of key species in Lower Segama is patchy. Some improvements in local status due to baseline conservation efforts against overall picture of decline.	(i) At least an additional 50km (c.500 ha) of riparian habitat protected and enhanced through partnership agreements in strategically important areas for biodiversity conservation; (ii)10 honorary river rangers and 10 honorary wildlife rangers recruited from local communities, trained and engaged, and evaluated for upscaling by DID; (iii)at least 20 DID, EPD, SWD and other relevant agency staff trained in riverine biodiversity monitoring	(i)Private-public partnership agreements for protection and rehabilitation of riparian buffer zones (DID, project reports) (ii)DID, SWD and project reports (iii)DID and project reports (iv)DID, SWD and project reports	

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target	Source of Information	Risks and assumptions
			methods and protocols agreed and monitoring activities initiated. (iv) Documented expansion of riparian distribution of key species where habitat restoration has been conducted.		
	2.4 Community involvement at the demonstration sites provides socio-economic benefits to local communities and proactively engages women in the communities, indicated by: - number of households in target communities involved in implementing project activities (such as tree planting) on a paid basis; - proportion of women participating and benefiting from sustainable livelihood groups supported and facilitated by the project	No project supported activities underway.	Site 1: Orang Asli from at least 20 households trained and receive income from tourism and slope protection and rehabilitation activities; Site 2: At least 20 households actively participate in community groups promoting river quality improvements Site 3: At least 20 households trained and receive income from tourism, handicraft and seafood processing activities At least gender equity achieved in all sustainable livelihood activities through engagement of female facilitators for community groups	Project reports	

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comments	Responses	Re D
<b>Responses to GEF Secretariat review at Work Programme inclusion – February 11, 2014</b>		
<p><b>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</b> Please articulate which Aichi Targets the project will help to achieve and identify SMART indicators; for which the baseline and target will have to be defined at CEO approval.</p>	<p>The response on Aichi Targets and identification of SMART indicators was provided at PIF stage. Please see the Strategic Results Framework (Annex A above) for baseline and target values for the indicators.</p>	SR (in
<p><b>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</b>  Expected activities, targeted achievements, baseline, and quantifiable indicators will have to be further developed/detailed at CEO endorsement and include specific reference to globally significant biodiversity status. Private sector and communities involvement is one of the project's pillars, therefore it is expected to receive a very comprehensive proposal; detailing their roles and the long term socio-economic benefit of supporting proposed activities. Regarding output 2.2 and 2.3, please bear in mind that BD-2 objective does not support habitat restoration.</p>	<p>Responses to these comments were provided at PIF stage. Further to these:</p> <p>SMART indicators specifying gender and local community benefits, as well as globally significant biodiversity have been included in the project's monitoring framework (see SRF). The selection of biodiversity indicators took into account the cost and feasibility of monitoring required, and also their practicality in reflecting the expected impacts of the project, which limits species-specific monitoring options but some are included nevertheless.</p> <p>The roles of private sector and community involvement are described in detail in the project outputs and stakeholder involvement plan. The main private sector involvement concerns oil palm plantations and small scale river tourism operators, which have expressed interest in the project, and will participate in Component 2 activities in particular. Local communities including indigenous peoples will participate and benefit from all three demonstration outputs.</p> <p>The project including its demonstration activities take an integrated approach towards the sustainable management of Malaysia's river ecosystems, which embraces all aspects of biodiversity mainstreaming. This includes improvements to the sustainability of urban river management practices, and oil palm establishment and management practices in line with RSPO guidelines for riparian buffer zones. The achievement of biodiversity conservation mainstreaming goals in these contexts demands an integrated approach that includes habitat protection, rehabilitation and management.</p>	SR Str IV Sta Inv Pla
<b>Responses to GEF Secretariat review at CEO Endorsement – June 18, 2015</b>		
<p>17. At CEO endorsement: Has cofinancing been confirmed?  No. Co-financing letters are missing from IJM and the Angling Association of Malaysia. The letter from the Global</p>	<p>Six cofinancing letters are now attached totaling \$ 7,580,000 - \$50,000 increase compared to the previous submission. The breakdown of co-financing is as follows.</p>	Pro Co co- buc  CE Tal

Environment Centre needs to break out separation between cash and in-kind.	Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)	C
	National Government	Department of Irrigation and Drainage / other federal agencies	Cash	5,850,000	
	GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	260,000	
	Local Government	3 state governments (Perak, Selangor and Sabah)	In kind	750,000	
	CSO	Global Environment Centre	Cash	300,000	
	CSO	Global Environment Centre	In kind	420,000	
	Total Co-financing				
<p>GEC co-financing includes financing from various CSOs partners including the Angling Association of Malaysia, Society for Greater EcoMelawati and the Round table on Sustainable Palm Oil, as well as from private sector partners, including IJM Plantations, Sime Darby Plantations/ Foundation; and PBB Oils.</p>					



**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>9</sup>**

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<b>PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 60,000</b>			
<b><i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i></b>	<b><i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i></b>		
	<b><i>Budgeted Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Spent To date</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Committed</i></b>
Activity 1: Policy Framework & Institutional Capacity Review, and Baseline Assessment	14,000.00	9,844.00	4,156.00
Activity 2: Target riverine landscape profiling including initial local biodiversity assessments and determination of exact target areas	17,000.00	11,953.32	5,046.68
Activity 3: Local stakeholder and gender assessment	5,000.00	3,515.00	1,485.00
Activity 4: Development of biodiversity pressure, state, response indicators, with baseline and targets	5,000.00	3,515.00	1,485.00
Activity 5: GEF Tracking Tool Baseline Assessment	3,000.00	2,110.00	890.00
Activity 6: Environmental and Social Screening	3,000.00	2,109.66	890.34
Activity 7: Feasibility Analysis and Budget	13,000.00	9,146.18	3,853.82
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>60,000.00</u></b>	<b><u>42,193.16</u></b>	<b><u>17,806.84</u></b>

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLows (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

<sup>9</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.