



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5692		
Country/Region:	Malaysia		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming of Biodiversity Conservation into River Management		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5281 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$60,000	Project Grant:	\$1,404,000
Co-financing:	\$7,530,000	Total Project Cost:	\$8,994,000
PIF Approval:	March 19, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Midori Paxton

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	02/11/2014: Yes	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	02/11/2014: Yes, the OFP endorsed the project, in a letter dated 22 January 2014.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	02/11/2014: Yes, the proposed grant is within the resources available from STAR/BD focal area. Cleared.	
	• the focal area allocation?	02/11/2014: Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	02/11/2014: N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or	02/11/2014: N/A	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	02/11/2014: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	02/11/2014: N/A	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>02/11/2014: Yes, the project is well aligned with the BD Focal Area strategy. 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>03/05/2014: Addressed.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>02/11/2014: The project is consistent with the country's national strategies. Philippines common vision on Biodiversity specifically calls for maintenance of integrity of aquatic systems and the mainstreaming of biodiversity into river basin management. Cleared.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>02/11/2014: The project baseline explains well the threats and challenges of the river basin management: infrastructure/economic development, weakness of the legal framework and lack of cross-sectoral coordination; lack of capacity and environmental knowledge; poor engagement with local communities and private sector. The ongoing initiatives to address river basin management are well described. At CEO approval, further details will have to be provided regarding the specificity of each of the three pilot sites. Cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>02/11/2014: The project framework is clear. Please provide SMART indicators, including on status of globally significant biodiversity (baseline and targets will be provided at CEO approval). The scope of the project intervention is broad from IAS, to river bank protection, to biodiversity mainstreaming in oil palm plantations; therefore please be very specific on the expected activities and achievements. Significant portion of Component 1 is dedicated to capacity development, therefore, it is suggested that component 2 focuses on pilot demonstration and remove the activities related to capacity building. Output 2.2 and 2.3, please further explain what physical enhancement of riverine habitats and habitat rehabilitation will mean. Output 2.3 states that the project will foster a high engagement of local communities and private sector and will rely on good practises developed by them; please provide few examples. Further details on activities developed at the pilot site will have to be provided at CEO approval (e.g IAS, river bank protection, forest rehabilitation).</p> <p>05/05/2014:Cleared at PIF stage. Expected activities, targeted achievements, baseline, and quantifiable indicators will have to be further developed/detailed at CEO endorsement and include specific reference to globally</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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 doesn't support habitat restoration.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>02/11/2014: Yes, the global environmental benefits of the project are well identified. The project, by improving cross-sectoral coordination, reinforcing legal framework, will help the on-going initiatives to achieve sustainable outcomes. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>02/11/2014: The project mentions the participation of CSOs, however further details on how they will be involved in consultation/coordination mechanisms as well as how they will profit from on-the ground activities.</p> <p>03/05/2014: Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g.,</p>	<p>02/11/2014: Fine at PIF stage. Cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	02/11/2014: The project is consistent and complements well the on-going initiatives. Synergies should also be pursued with the UNDP "Multi-use forest landscape in Sabah".	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	02/11/2014: The project will ensure sustainability by fostering a higher engagement of local communities, private sector into an holistic management of river basin. The project will enhance national and state level initiatives to develop cross-sectoral framework. Cleared.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B	02/11/2014: There is a shell Table 2: the indicative co-financing for the total	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	<p>appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>project cost is US\$7,330,000 and not 7,530,000 as indicated. Please adjust accordingly. The funding and co-financing as indicated are appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes.</p> <p>03/05/2014: Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>02/11/2014: The co-financing is about 1:5.36; which is fine. UNDP is providing US\$30,000 in cash; regarding its role, we could except a higher co-financing from the agency. Please clarify if the Local government co-financing is either in cash or in in-kind. If it is both, please specify the amount per type of co-financing by adding a line.</p> <p>03/05/2014: Cleared at PIF stage. It is noted that UNDP country office will explore to enhance co-financing.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>02/11/2014: The project management cost is about 9.6%; which is below the ceiling for MSP. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	<p>02/11/2014: Yes a PPG is requested. The amount requested doesn't deviate from the norm. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>20/11/2014: N/A</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	02/11/2014: The project cannot be recommended at this stage, please address the comments raised in the above items. 03/05/2014: The project proposal is technically cleared and recommended for inclusion in next Work Program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	February 11, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 05, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**