



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5296		
Country/Region:	Malaysia		
Project Title:	Third National Communications (TNC) to the UNFCCC and Biennial Update Reporting (BUR)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5130 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$852,000
Co-financing:	\$804,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,656,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Yamil Bonduki

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	RM, Feb 22, 2013: Malaysia is eligible to receive resources.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * ¹	RM, Feb 22, 2013: A letter from the operational focal point is on the file.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	RM, Feb 22, 2013: UNDP has a comparative advantage for this kind of project. UNDP has extensive experience with these kind of activities.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? *	RM, Feb 22, 2013: Yes the project fits into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country.
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	
	• the focal area allocation?	
	• focal area set-aside?	RM, Feb 22, 2013: The resources are available from the focal area set aside. US\$500,000 for national communications and US\$352,000 for the biennial update report.

¹ Questions 2, 3, 4, 18 and 19 are applicable only to EAs submitted through Agencies.
EA review template: updated June 7 2011

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	RM, Feb 22, 2013: The project is aligned with the focal areas framework
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	RM, Feb 22, 2013: Please identify the relevant GEF focal area objective in the project.
	8. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	RM, Feb 22, 2013: The project is consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments. .
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	RM, Feb 22, 2013: The project is associated with the Green Technology and Climate Change Council and the project will support activities to improve data collection. Some clarification needs to be provided on how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of the project. For example is the setting up of a database with informatics tools for data updating and retrieving actually the establishment of a green house gas information system which would ensure the continual gathering of data for future GHG inventories. Please clarify.
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	RM, Feb 22, 2013: Clarification is requested on the exact years for which the greenhouse gas inventories will be completed. It appears that both components 2 and 3 of the project will complete an inventory for the year 2010. Please clarify specifically which components will complete which years for greenhouse gas inventories. For example will component 2 complete the inventory for the year 2008 and 2009, with component 3 completing the year 2010?
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	RM, Feb 22, 2013: Further information should be provided on how gender dimensions are being considered in the project. For example will the workshops in component 1 involve civil society organizations whose focus is on gender issues?
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	RM, Feb 22, 2013: There is public participation in the project.
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	RM, Feb 22, 2013: For the most part the project is consistent and coordinated with other relevant institutions. Component 5 includes the identification of the necessary technologies to be adopted but there is no link to the UNEP Global Technology Needs Assessment project (GEF PMIS #4948). Further information should be provided on how the project will be coordinated with the UNEP Global Technology Needs Assessment project.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	RM, Feb 22, 2013: The project implementation arrangements are adequate.
Project Financing	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	RM, Feb 22, 2013: The itemized budget is justified.
	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	RM, Feb 22, 2013: The project management costs are appropriate
	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	RM, Feb 22, 2013: The funding and co-financing per objective is appropriate.
	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	RM, Feb 22, 2013: The project is financed at full cost and thus cofinancing is not required for this project.
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	RM, Feb 22, 2013: The in-kind cofinancing that the agency is providing is in line with its role.
	20. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for financial management and procurement assessment.	
Agency Responses	21. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	• STAP?	
	• Convention Secretariat?	
	• Other GEF Agencies?	

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>RM, Feb 22, 2013: EA clearance is not currently recommended. Please address issues in boxes 7,9, 10, 11 and 13. Please also include an indicative timeline for submission of the national communications and the biennial update report.</p> <p>RM April 22 2013: The clarifications provided are sufficient. EA clearance is recommended.</p> <p>RM July 12th 2013: The updated project proposal is recommended for clearance and inclusion in an upcoming work program.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review**	
	Additional review (as necessary)	
	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.**