

UNDP GEF APR/PIR 2007 - BIODIVERSITY

(1 July 2006 to 30 June 2007)

I. Basic Project Data

Official Title:	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Tropical Peat Swamp Forests and Associated Wetland Ecosystems		
-----------------	--	--	--

Country/ies:	MALAYSIA	PIMS Number	522
		Atlas Project Number	00013477

Focal Area	BIODIVERSITY	Project Type (FSP/MSP)	FSP
Strategic Priority	SP- 2	Operational Programme	OP - 3

Date of Entry into Work Programme	31 October 2000	Planned Project Duration	60 months (5years)
ProDoc Signature Date	7 March 2001	Original Planned Closing Date	March 2006
Date of First Disbursement	10 June 2002 Project started operations end of June 2002	Revised Planned ¹ Closing Date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 2007 • 31 December 2008 (endorsed by the NSC on 10 July 2007)
Is this the Terminal APR/PIR?	NO	Date Project Operationally Closed (if applicable)	

Date Mid Term Evaluation ² carried out (if applicable)	18 September to 30 October 2005	Date Final Evaluation ¹ carried out (if applicable)	
---	---------------------------------	--	--

Dates of visits to project by UNDP country office	Attachment 1	Date of last TPR Meeting	
Date of last visit to project by UNDP-GEF RTA	11 April 2007		

¹ Please explain any entry here in section V on "Changes in project schedule"

² If an evaluation has been carried out in the last 12 months the report should be attached to this document.

FINAL 11 July 2007

Project Contacts:

Title	Name	E-mail	Date	Signature
National Project Manager / Coordinator	Dr Abdul Rahim Nik	rahimnik@frim.gov.my	21 July 2006	
Government GEF OFP ³ (optional)	Dr Teddy Lian	drlian@NRE.GOV.MY		
UNDP Country Office Programme Manager	Dr Hari Ramalu Ragavan	hariramalu.ragavan@undp.org		
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor	Joseph D'Cruz	Joseph.dacruz@undp.org		

Project Summary (as in PIMS and ProDoc)

The primary objective of this project is to develop and implement plans and to encourage processes that will ensure the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant genetic, species and ecosystem diversity within tropical peat swamp forests in Malaysia. This will contribute to implementation of the Malaysian Biodiversity Action Plan by providing demonstrations of conservation and sustainable management of peat swamp forests. The project will ensure conservation and sustainable use at three sites, as well as demonstrating what is required for adoption of a multi-sectoral approach to peat swamp forest management throughout Malaysia. It will support the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and Ramsar Convention.

³ In the case of a project involving more than 1 country, it is suggested that for simplicity only the OFP (optional) and Country Office Programme Manager from the lead country sign-off. If representatives from more than 1 country sign off, please add additional rows as necessary, clearly indicating the country name for each signature.

II. Progress towards achieving project objectives

Project Objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator ⁴	Baseline Level ⁵	Target Level ⁴	Level ⁴ at 30 June 2007
Objective: Develop and implement plans to encourage process that will ensure conservation and sustainable use	I. Reduced fragmentation of Peat Swamp Forest (PSF) & promote ecosystem integrity of existing areas	Threatened PSF integrity & protected species. Areas to manage: - Klias (3,600ha) - LBNP (10,736ha) - SEPPSF (87,045ha)	Areas specified in Project Document to be maintained (totaling to 100,138 ha) Additional areas to serve as buffer and extension: Sabah: 30% Pahang: 40% Sarawak: N/A	Some of the management approaches and prescriptions for external zonation to stabilise the dynamics in areas adjacent to the PSF were proposed and accepted by the respective state authorities. Sabah: The gazettement of the additional 2,096 ha extension conservation area has been approved by the state authorities. Pahang: The state authorities approved 32,070ha of extension area as buffer zone and permanent forest reserve. The gazettement of 12,070 ha of PSF area as forest reserve extension has been initiated. Sarawak: The State Wetlands Management Committee exploring “green buffer” to the north of the Park.

⁴ This should describe the quantitative indicator

⁵ This should be a quantitative numerical value

<p><u>Outcome 1:</u> Increased knowledge on biodiversity of PSF</p>	<p>2. Detailed information obtained on PSF ecosystem</p>	<p>Marginal</p>	<p>Comprehensive info about PSF ecosystem & biodiversity richness & physico-environment available</p> <p>Integrated IDMS in place and operational</p>	<p>- Three (3) sets of data on flora, fauna, physico-environment, socio-economy were compiled and being integrated into Information Management System (developed by the PSF Project) in its final development stage, based on field testing of selected parameters for ecological monitoring at the respective sites.</p> <p>Among the new surveys were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sarawak: Birds and bats; medicinal plants & community participation studies • Sabah: Socio-economic valuation of PSF resource uses; study on proboscis monkey feeding behaviour, and • Pahang: Ethno-botany study; soil survey; hydrological modeling assessments; and eco-tourism feasibility study. <p>- 13 gene bank plots were established and procedures for monitoring being developed.</p>
---	--	-----------------	---	--

	<p>3. Dissemination of information on PSF</p>	<p>Insignificant</p>	<p>Full dissemination & sharing of information through various means and various stakeholders.</p> <p>Website in full operation, regular distribution of newsletter to stakeholders.</p> <p>A strong network of PSF friends established.</p>	<p>The project has carried out the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Printed four books, and four more being edited; • Produced & presented no less than 45 papers (16 from Jul'06 to June'07) at various conferences, seminars or workshops with two published in journals; • Produced six editions of the Project newsletter (<i>Leaf</i>) for distribution to stakeholders and major university libraries; • Co-organised with the Malaysian Nature Society (MNS) and the Education Ministry a National Youth Workshop for 220 students and teachers & a School Nature Club Eastern Zone Camp in Pahang for 120 students to promote PSF awareness; • Collaborated with MNS to include PSF info in the school curriculum, helping to develop the KPA textbook; • Worked with state agencies to produce Environmental Education module for primary and secondary schools in Sarawak. • Produced a video documentary CD titled "Voices of Loagan" on the music of local communities of LBNP; & a 3CD-pack containing TV3 documentaries on PSF conservation. • Co-organised with FRIM and Sarawak Forest Department the World Wetlands Day celebration in FRIM and Sarawak respectively; • Supported FRIM's World Forestry Day involving 200 school children; • Contributed updated information to the National Action Plan on Peatlands. • Co-organised Soil Conference in Mukah, April 2007. • Produced CD on canal blocking demonstration in Klias, Sabah.
--	---	----------------------	--	---

	4. Establishment & operationalisation of Information Management System (IMS)	Non existent	IMS in place, tested and validated for full operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All data on flora, fauna, physical environment, socio-economy in the database system updated. The IMS is in the final stage of development, with integration of the ecological monitoring system for decision-making support. Field-testing of the monitoring system conducted in Feb '07. Through consultations with various parties, the ecological monitoring system framework and design were finalised, and the programming undertaken.
Outcome 2: Well-formulated site management plans	5. Planning instrument and consultative process	Absence of inter-agency planning	Three planning core teams (MPCT) established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The multi-sectoral and broader stakeholder consultations (Sabah: Eight (8) agencies; Sarawak: 12 agencies; and Pahang: 11 agencies) concluded. The following three (3) management plans were finalised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Klias Forest Reserve Conservation Plan (Sabah); - Loagan Bunut National Park Management Plan (Sarawak); and - Integrated Management Plan (IMP) of the South-East Pahang Peat Swamp Forest.
	6. Management Plan (Sabah)	Absence of the site-management plan	Final draft finalised mid-2005 and adopted by end 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Klias Forest Reserve Conservation Plan (KFRCP) published. A supplementary Proboscis Monkey Protection Plan formulated in February 2007. The state authorities endorsed the KFRCP on 29 June 2007.
	7. Management Plan (Sarawak)	Absence of the site-management plan	Final draft finalised mid 2005 adopted by end 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two supplementary documents to LBNP Management Plan, namely 'Business Plan for LBNP' and 'Community Participation Plan' finalised. The LBNP Management Plan was approved by the state authorities on 21 June 2007.

	8. Management Plan (Pahang)	Absence of the site-management plan	Final draft finalised end 2005 and adopted March 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IMP of the SEPPSF published, and a supplementary 'Forest Management Plan' initiated. The IMP was endorsed by the state authorities on 5 July 2007.
Outcome 3: Demonstration of conservation, management and sustainable use of PSF	9. Selected management actions executed (Sabah)	No actions nor mitigation measures undertaken	16 management activities as prescribed	15 activities implemented
	10. Selected prescriptions under management plan executed (Sarawak)	No mitigation measures undertaken	10 management activities as prescribed	Six (6) activities implemented, the latest being the installation of eco-sanitary device as a mitigation measure to curb pollution.
	11. Selected prescriptions under management plan executed (Pahang)	No specific management measures	Zonation introduced; ESA adopted; 3 specific guidelines	Zonation and Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) adopted. Two (2) guidelines endorsed by the state and published. The process of gazettelement of forest reserve extension initiated.
	12. Improved logging practices in SEPPSF	Use of improper logging techniques. Absence of appropriate logging guidelines	Contribute conservation aspect into the development of the guidelines for sustainable timber harvesting (with Danida).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stateland Logging Guidelines adopted by the state and published. Various activities under the FRIM study on optimum harvesting regime including felling operation completed and post-felling inventory being initiated. Training on Reduced Impact Harvesting (RIH) for logging contractors undertaken. RIH Guidelines prepared and published.
Outcome 4: Network of inter-agency at the state level	13. Frequency of consultations (Sabah)	zero	12 times	12 times
	14. Frequency of consultations (Sarawak)	zero	6 times	Nine (9) times
	15. Frequency of consultations (Pahang)	zero	13 times	12 times

	16. Increased level of capacity in related state agencies for coordinated planning	Absence of coordination	No. of staff trained: 46 Full operation of state-level PSF inter-agency forum	No. of staff trained: 46 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Three (3) state-level Management Plan Core Teams fully functional.• The Sabah and Pahang State Wetlands Management Committee (WMC) have been approved for operation.
Outcome 5: Enhanced stakeholders awareness	17. Number of longhouses or villages in/around the PSF more aware about PSF importance	None	2 longhouses (LBNP), 9 villages (SEPPSF), and 6 villages (Klias	
	18. No. of write-ups, news stories and feature articles published about PSF issues	None recorded	At least 60 news/feature articles	A total of 53 news/feature articles published in local national and state newspapers from July 2006 to June 2007. *TV3 produced a 43-min documentary on the SEPPSF entitled “ <i>Permata Air Hitam</i> ” aired on 10 March 2007. <i>(*TV3 is a leading commercial TV station in Malaysia, commanding mass audience in rural and urban areas, which had sought the Project’s cooperation to produce three non-sponsored documentaries featuring the respective sites.)</i>
	Private sector engagement	None	At least 6 major events for stakeholder consultations and 10 business luncheon/dialogues be organised	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Three (3) stakeholder consultations targeting plantation owners/companies carried out.• Seven (7) business luncheons were organised.
	Government – decision makers/politicians	None	No less than 38 meetings on peat swamp forest conservation be organized at the state and federal level	47 meetings conducted.

<p>Outcome 6: Enhanced institutional and human capacities</p>	<p>19. Alternative / Supplemental livelihood programmes</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Six pilot demonstration programmes undertaken.</p>	<p>In Sarawak, training on fruit tree planting and fish farming conducted for 20 local community participants; a study tour to Pahang for 15 participants; and a series of dialogues involving 25 participants from seven longhouses around LBNP.</p> <p>In Sabah, a workshop on fish farming with 18 community participants; training on nature interpretation involving 22 participants from several villages in Klias; eight-month on-the-job training in nursery management for eight community volunteers; and an intensive training on forestry nursery and restoration with 22 participants.</p> <p>In Pahang, five (5) workshops, seven (7) dialogues with 131 participants from 19 Asli Jakun villages; and five (5) trainings with 63 participants from the Jakun Simpai Village.</p>
---	---	-------------	---	--

	20. Training	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. of staff trained: 200 • Managerial level (national) • Operational level on series of thematic training 	<p>No. of staff trained: 272</p> <p>National: two (2) training for foresters and multi-agency staff on PSF wetlands conservation & training on use of new ARGIS software respectively. (Participants: 48 persons)</p> <p>Sarawak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) One (1) Native Customary Rights workshop held involving 15 participants from six (6) agencies; b) Two (2) trainings on basic forestry and environment (60 participants); and c) One (1) environmental monitoring exercise/field testing (11 participants). <p>Sabah:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Training on environmental education and awareness campaign (22 participants); b) Training on community extension services for forest rangers (12 participants); and c) Workshop on Fire Management in Klias Peninsula Peatlands (30 participants). <p>Pahang:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Training on peat fire management (22 participants); b) Training on Reduced Impact Logging in PSF for logging contractors (40 participants); c) Training on forest seed collection and nursery handling techniques (20 participants); d) One (1) study tour; and e) Two (2) dialogues (40 participants).
--	--------------	------	--	---

Rating of Project Progress towards Meeting Objective⁶

	2006 Rating	2007 Rating	Comments
National Project Manager/Coordinator	HS	HS	The Project contributed to the country's position at the Malaysian National Action Plan (NAP) on Peatlands under the initiative of the ASEAN Peatland Management Initiative (APMI), as well as to the National Conference on Biodiversity. The Project also promotes inter-agency coordination on PSF and wetlands management at the federal and state levels.
Government GEF OFFP ⁷ <i>(optional)</i>			
UNDP Country Office	HS	HS	The Integrated Management Plans in all three sites have been completed, and adopted by the State governments. Some of the recommendations are already being implemented.
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor	HS	HS	The project is well on track to achieve all agreed outcomes agreed in the original design, even though these have taken longer to achieve than originally envisaged. In addition, the project has undertaken more awareness-raising and policy engagement work than the original project design required. In the coming year, a key challenge for the project will be to play a substantive role in the evolving policy discussions around peatlands, carbon emissions and avoided deforestation. This policy debate will decisively shape the future of peatland conservation in South-East Asia, and this project is well-placed to lead the UNDP and GEF contribution to this policy debate.

Action Plan to Address Marginally Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory Rating

Where a project has received a rating of MU, U or HU describe the actions to be taken to address this:

Action to be Taken	By Whom?	By When?

⁶ Ratings: See instruction sheet for definitions of ratings. Use only:

HS - Highly Satisfactory; S – Satisfactory; MS – Marginally Satisfactory; MU - Marginally Unsatisfactory; U – Unsatisfactory; HU – Highly Unsatisfactory.

⁷ In the case of a project involving more than 1 country, it is suggested that for simplicity only the OFFP (optional) and Country Office Programme Manager from the lead country sign-off. If representatives from more than 1 country sign off, please add additional rows as necessary, clearly indicating the country name for each signature.

III. Progress in Project implementation

List the 4 key outputs delivered so far for each project Outcome:

Project Outcomes	Key Outputs
Outcome 1: Knowledge on peat swamp forests	1. We Live Here Too—The Jakun and the Pahang Peat Swamp Forest.
	2. Looking at Loagan—A Journey Into Loagan Bunut National Park, Sarawak.
	3. Tumbuhan Ubatan di Taman Negara Loagan Bunut, Sarawak (<i>Medicinal Plants of the Loagan Bunut National Park, Sarawak</i>).
	4. Visitors' Guide: Loagan Bunut National Park, Sarawak, Malaysian Borneo.
Outcome 2: Planning process & Management plans	1. Three multi-sectoral management plan core teams (MPCTs) established
	2. Klias Forest Reserve Conservation Plan
	3. Loagan Bunut National Park Management Plan
	4. Integrated Management Plan for South-East Asia Pahang Peat Swamp Forests
Outcome 3: Demonstrations	1. Establishment of conservation corridors to promote integrity of four fragmented PSF areas in Pahang
	2. Reduced Impact Harvesting Guidelines in Peat Swamp Forest Reserve
	3. Demonstration plot for rehabilitation of degraded peat swamp forests
	4. Development of fire management guidelines and training on fire management
Outcome 4: Inter-Agency Network	1. Intensive and regular coordination among state key agencies during the planning process
	2. Adoption of consultative planning process which involved local communities
	3. Special Park Committee representing indigenous peoples for Loagan Bunut National Park
	4. Establishment of Wetland Management Committees (Sabah and Pahang)
Outcome 5: Awareness Raising	1. Working with NGO through its national network of school nature clubs, inserting into the school curriculum and nature education activities sheets
	2. Facilitated research of six post-graduate thesis regarding peat swamp forest
	3. No less than 220 articles published in newspapers, magazines & 7 editions of <i>Leaf</i> , the PSF project newsletter, two documentary CDs (plus a three-pack TV3 documentaries)
	4. Distributed PSF publications to selected institutes of higher learnings in Malaysia as well as in neighbouring countries such as Thailand, Singapore and Indonesia.
Outcome 6: Local Capacity	1. Introduced series of specific national training on wetlands conservation with Wetlands International, apart from local thematic training on biodiversity aspects
	2. Facilitated a traditional medicinal garden project for the Jakun community
	3. Initiated three fish rearing livelihood programmes for indigenous & local communities
	4. Handicraft training – assistance in marketing & promotion of products, formation of protocol for protecting Indigenous Knowledge.

FINAL 11 July 2007

Rating of Project Implementation⁸

	2006 Rating	2007 Rating	Comments
National Project Manager/Coordinator	S	HS	The three (3) State Steering Committee and National Steering Committee have recognised the achievements of the PSF Project and expressed satisfaction over the progress made.
Government GEF OFP ⁹ (optional)			
UNDP Country Office	S	HS	Implementation of all activities are progressing well including Sarawak where initially it was a little slow. In fact the Sarawak State government proposed to submit the project site as Ramsar site.
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor	S	S	Although the pace of implementation is significantly slower than outlined in the original project design, the project remains on track to complete all agreed outcomes.

Action Plan to Address Marginally Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory Rating

Where a project has received a rating of MU, U or HU describe the actions to be taken to address this:

Action to be Taken	By Whom?	By When?

⁸ Ratings: See instruction sheet for definitions of ratings. Use only:

HS - Highly Satisfactory; S – Satisfactory; MS – Marginally Satisfactory; MU - Marginally Unsatisfactory; U – Unsatisfactory; HU – Highly Unsatisfactory.

⁹ In the case of a project involving more than 1 country, it is suggested that for simplicity only the OFP (optional) and Country Office Programme Manager from the lead country sign-off. If representatives from more than 1 country sign off, please add additional rows as necessary, clearly indicating the country name for each signature.

IV. Risks

1. Please annex to this report a print out of the corresponding Atlas Risk Tab (please use landscape format and only print the frame).



UN Development Programme
Report ID: UNFMQTRR

Project Quarterly Progress Report

Page 1 of 5
Run Time: 22-08-2007 02:08:03

Business Unit: MYS10
Award Id: 00013477
Description: FEAT SWAMP FOREST PROJECT
Implementing Partner: 01933 National Execution
Award Start Date: 31/05/2001 Award End Date: 31/05/2007
Report Period From: 01/07/2006 Report Period to: 30/07/2007 Total Award Amount: 4,580,241.00

Section 1. Project Implementation

A. UPDATED PROJECT RISKS

Type	Date	Description	Date	Manager Resp	Critical Status
ENVIRONMENTAL		No Record			
OPERATIONAL	12/10/2005	Decisions will not be sufficiently affected by increased awareness and popular support of PSF values - modest risk	02/08/2006	To institutionalise the working mechanism of the management planning process in relation to the formation of state wetlands management committees	N
ORGANIZATIONAL	12/10/2005	Integrated management plans developed by the respective state inter-agency core teams will not be implemented - modest risk	02/08/2006	Selected action plans under the integrated management plans are being implemented by the state authorities with the project assistance	N
ORGANIZATIONAL	02/08/2006	Delayed in the development / preparation and implementation of management plan in Sarawak due to the transfer of the state national park management from Sarawak Forestry Department to a state-owned private entity, Sarawak Forestry Corporation	02/08/2006	Intensive consultations with Sarawak Forestry Corporation were conducted to discuss the issues and a Note of Understanding was signed by both parties to expedite implementation of selected project activities, such as: staff training, database installation, awareness campaigns, lake siltation mitigation measures.	N
POLITICAL		No Record			

2. For any risks identified as “critical” please copy the following information from Atlas:

Risk Type	Date Identified	Risk Description	Risk Management Response

V. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the logical framework matrix, since the Project Document signature:

Change Made to:	Yes/No	Reason for Change
Project Objective	No	
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs / Activities / Inputs	No	

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes.

Change	Reason for Change
Closing Date has been extended from June 2007 to December 2007	Recommended by the Mid-Term Review conducted in September-October 2005 and endorsed by the Sixth National Steering Committee Meeting held on 12 January 2006.
Project extension till 31 December 2008	Taking into account the Mid-Term Review recommendation, the project implementation status, and requests from the three states, the National Steering Committee has approved the Project's extension during its 8 th meeting on 10 July 2007.

VI. Financial Information

Please present all financial values in US\$ millions to 2 decimal places only (e.g. \$3,502,000 should be written as \$3.50m)

Name of Partner or Contributor (including the Private Sector)	Nature of Contributor ¹⁰	Amount used in Project Preparation (PDF A, B)	Amount committed in Project Document ¹¹	Additional amounts committed after Project Document finalization ¹¹	Estimated Total Disbursement to 30 June 2007	Expected Total Disbursement by end of project
GEF Contribution	GEF		\$5.98m		\$3.40m	\$5.98
Cash Cofinancing – UNDP Managed						
UNDP (TRAC)	UN Agency					
<i>(add rows as necessary)</i>						
Cash Cofinancing – Partner Managed						
Government			\$5.28m		\$5.3	\$5.5
Danida			\$2.40m		2.40	\$2.4
EU/UNDP*				\$0.05m	\$0.03m	\$0.05
In-Kind Cofinancing			\$4.39m		\$3.47m	\$4.39
<i>(add rows as necessary)</i>						
Total Cofinancing			\$12.07m	\$0.05m	\$11.2	\$12.34
Total for Project			\$18.05m		\$14.6	18.32

* Additional funds (RM 200,000) were committed by EU/UNDP Small Grant to finance expanded activity to establish medicinal plant garden for Jakun indigenous people in Pahang.

Comments

¹⁰ Specify if: UN Agency, other Multilateral, Bilateral Donor, Regional Development Bank (RDB), National Government, Local Government, NGO, Private Sector, Other.

¹¹ Committed amounts are those shown in the approved Project Document. These may be zero in the case of new leveraged project partners.

Please explain any significant changes in project financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement:

VII. Additional Financial Instruments used in the Project

This section only needs to be completed if the project provides funds to any Financial Instruments such as: Trust Funds, Sinking Funds, Revolving Funds, Partial Credit Risk Guarantees, Microfinance services, Leasing or Insurance mechanisms.

If this project does not use any Additional Financial Instruments skip this and go to Section VIII.

Financial Instrument	Financial Institution Responsible for Management	Basis for Selection of Financial Institution

For Each Financial Instrument please complete the following two tables:

Name of Financial Instrument:

Source of Funds (add rows for each source)	Funds Committed in Project Document	Amount Disbursed to Date	Issues or Comments
GEF			

Rating of Performance of Financial Instrument¹²

	2006 Rating	Comments
National Project Manager/Coordinator		
Government GEF OFP		
UNDP Country Office		
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor		
Overall Rating		

¹² For ratings, use only:

HS - Highly Satisfactory; S – Satisfactory; MS – Marginally Satisfactory; MU - Marginally Unsatisfactory; U – Unsatisfactory; HU – Highly Unsatisfactory.

Action Plan to Address Marginally Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory Rating

Where a project has received a rating of MU, U or HU describe the actions to be taken to address this:

Action to be Taken	By Whom?	By When?

End of Project Situation

What is to happen to any funds remaining in the Financial Instrument at the end of the project?

--

VIII. Lessons

Are there any lessons from this project that could benefit the design and implementation of other GEF-funded projects? Please list up to three and indicate which one/s could be worth developing into case studies of good/bad practice.

- | |
|--|
| i) Multi-stakeholders consultations during the site management planning had enhanced cooperation and collaboration among the different state agencies in defining the policy direction and strategies for implementation of action plans. |
| ii) Efforts to consult and engage the media in discussions on PSF conservation had resulted in the forging of a crucial partnership for public awareness and education purposes. This is evident in the support given by the media in terms of coverage on PSF issues including TV3, a leading commercial television station in the country, which produced three documentaries focusing on the three PSF Project sites. |

IX. Project Contribution to GEF Strategic Targets in Biodiversity

For all Projects:

Please answer all questions	State: Yes, No or In- Progress	Additional Notes
BD1: Protected Areas		
Have any new protected areas been established as a result of this project? (if any)	Yes	If yes, name these and state the area of each (hectares): Bukau-API Api Protection Forest Reserve (2,096 ha)) is being gazetted as an extension to the Klias Forest Reserve, which is the project site in Sabah
Has the project resulted in any changes to the policy, legislative, or regulatory environment of protected areas?	Yes	If yes, list the changes that have been made: The introduction of a consultative planning process involving various state agencies including forestry sector and agriculture, irrigation, local district planning, wildlife, and others. Other changes include the amended traditional fishing regulations of the local communities in the Loagan Bunut National Park, Sarawak and some newly-gazetted protected areas in Pahang
Has the project raised awareness or knowledge about protected areas in people beyond the project team?	Yes	If yes, amongst which target audiences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private sector, oil palm plantations • Local communities • Local government agencies including the Department of Wildlife and National Parks and universities
Has the project resulted in any changes in institutional arrangements and mandates concerning protected areas	Yes	If yes, list the changes that have been made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishment of inter-sectoral planning teams • Establishment of wetland management committees
How many protected areas already have improved management capacity as a result of this project?	Yes, three (3) areas	If yes, name these and state the area of each (hectares): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Klias Forest Reserve (3,630 ha) • Loagan Bunut National Park (10,736 ha) • Pahang Peat Swamp Forest (40,000 ha) • Expansion of Klias conservation area into Bukau Api-api (2,096 ha), gazette process initiated • Expansion of permanent forest reserve to add 25,000 ha in Pahang, additional areas approved • Adoption of new guidelines related to logging practices
Have any new financial mechanisms for protected areas (such as user fees, tourist taxes, payments for environmental services, etc) been created, or existing mechanisms strengthened as a result of this project?	No	If yes, list these:
Has the project improved relationships between protected areas and local communities?	Yes	If yes, how? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project facilitated the dialogues with local communities and incorporated their views into the management plans • Collaboration with local communities in infrastructure development, fire management and forest restoration.

Please answer all questions	State: Yes, No or In- Progress	Additional Notes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Sarawak, the Project facilitated the formation of the Special Park Committee comprising representatives of Berawan community.
Has the project worked with Indigenous communities?	Yes	If yes, name the groups and what was done: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Berawan, Penan and Iban (Sarawak) Jakun community (Pahang)
Has the project taken any measures associated with adaptation to climate change?	Yes	If yes, what? The Project has initiated additional studies on peat and carbon.
Has the project assessed the carbon benefits of the protected areas with which it is working?	In progress	If yes, state number of tonnes. The project has studied the peat soil profile and will determine carbon sequestration capacity
Does the project have a budget for activities related to dissemination?	Yes	If yes, how many other protected areas, or protected area authorities (provinces, districts, etc), have so far adopted approaches promoted by the project, and over what area (ha)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sabah Forestry Department; 100,000 ha Sarawak; 56,000 ha Pahang; 250,000 ha
BD2: Spatial Mainstreaming:		
Has the project resulted in any changes in the policy, legislative, or regulatory environment so that biodiversity is better addressed in the political and spatial planning for an area such as a whole country, province, district or community?	In progress	If yes, what is the area covered? (ha) List the changes that have been made? <p>In Klias, Sabah, the conservation plan was developed as an integral part of Beaufort District Plan (100,000 ha); a supplementary proboscis monkeys protection plan is also developed to focus on the southern wetland ecotones</p> <p>In Pahang, the management plan developed by the project has been incorporated into the District Local Plan (380,500 ha) and consistent with the National Physical Plan (13.2 million.ha)</p> <p>In Sarawak, the management plan was developed as an integral part of network of Totally Protected Areas (1 million ha)</p>
Has the project resulted in any changes in institutional arrangements and mandates so that biodiversity is better addressed in the political and spatial planning for an area such as a whole country, province, district or community?	In progress	If yes, what is the area covered? (ha) List the changes that have been made? <p>At the state level,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adoption of multi-sectoral planning system Integration of forestry sectoral plan into the district plans Adoption of new zonation and buffer zones Adoption of environmentally sensitive areas concept policy
Has the project resulted in any changes in practices such that biodiversity is better addressed in the political and	Yes	If yes, what is the area covered? (ha) List the changes that have been made? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment of wetland management committees to

Please answer all questions	State: Yes, No or In- Progress	Additional Notes
spatial planning for an area such as a whole country, province, district or community?		oversee multi-sectoral approach in addressing land use and management of peat swamp forest and its associated ecosystems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peatland Management and Development Guidelines
Has the project taken any measures associated with adaptation to climate change?	No	If yes, what?
Does the project have a budget for activities related to dissemination?	Yes	If yes, what other spatial governments (provinces, districts, etc) have so far adopted approaches promoted by the project, and over what area (ha)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Klias Peninsula; 100,000ha • Sarawak; 56,000 ha • Pahang; 250,000 ha
BD3: Sectoral Mainstreaming:		
Has the project resulted in any changes in the policy, legislative, or regulatory environment so that biodiversity is better addressed in a particular government sector such as forestry, fisheries, mining, tourism, agriculture, etc.?	Yes	If yes name the sectors and for each sector: List the changes that have been made in that sector? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of Environmental Sensitive Areas (ESA) • Provisions of new EIA measures • Revival of Traditional Berawan Fishing Regulations of Loagan Bunut
Has the project resulted in any changes in institutional arrangements and mandates so that biodiversity is better addressed in a particular government sector such as forestry, fisheries, mining, tourism, agriculture, etc.?	Yes	If yes name the sectors and for each sector: List the changes that have been made in that sector? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forestry issues were now discussed within the inter-agency forum (SPSC/WMC)
Has the project resulted in any changes in practices so that biodiversity is better addressed in a particular government sector such as forestry, fisheries, mining, tourism, agriculture, etc.?	Yes	If yes name the sectors and for each sector: List the changes that have been made in that sector? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fauna, ecosystems and socio-economic assessments have been included in addition to flora surveys • Application of new guidelines for stateland logging to minimize adverse impact to soil and hydrology • Introduction of better harvesting techniques for logging • Guidelines on Peat Forest Fire Prevention and Management
Has the project taken any measures associated with adaptation to climate change?	No	If yes, what?
Does the project have a budget for activities related to dissemination?	Yes	If yes, what other spatial governments (provinces, districts, etc) have so far adopted approaches promoted by the project, and over what area (ha) or sectors? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sarawak Forests Department and Sarawak Forestry Corporation • Sabah Forestry Department promoting multi-agency consultations in the formulation of Trus Madi Forest Reserve Management Plan. • Pahang Forestry Department and Economic Planning

Please answer all questions	State: Yes, No or In- Progress	Additional Notes
		Unit of Pahang State
BD4: Market Mainstreaming:		
Has the project resulted in any market changes such that they encourage more biodiversity friendly (conservation or sustainable use) practice?	No	If yes, identify the market (e.g. orchard grown fruit), the incentive system (e.g. higher prices for certified biodiversity friendly fruit), the biodiversity, and how it is affected (e.g. fruit tree pollinators not killed by pesticides).
Has the project improved the markets or profitability for any biodiversity or biodiversity based products?	No	If yes, list the products (e.g. tourism) and the biodiversity (e.g. coral reefs) on which they are based. Also comment on the implications for conservation and sustainable use.
Has the project resulted in certification or certification systems for any products?	No	If yes, list products being certified: e.g. timber, coffee, etc
Has the project increased the level of sustainable use of any species, races or groups of species or races?	In progress	If yes, list the species, races or groups: e.g. medicinal plants, wild rice relatives, <i>Prunus africana</i> . • Medicinal plants • <i>Gonystylus bancanus</i> (Ramin)
Has the project resulted in an improvement in the level of sustainable use of particular areas?	No	If yes, what is the area over which sustainable use has been improved (ha)? Explain how this was achieved
Has the projects increased the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits of BD?	No	If yes, list the actions being taken: e.g. changing policy, changing regulations, training communities, raising awareness, etc?
Has the project involved Indigenous No communities?	No	If yes, name the groups and how they were involved:
Has the project taken any measures associated with adaptation to climate change?	No	If yes, what?
Does the project have a budget for activities related to dissemination?	No	If yes, over what area (ha), or markets have the approaches disseminated by the project been replicated so far?
BD5: Organization or Business Mainstreaming		
Has the project resulted in any changes in the practices or behaviour of organizations or businesses such that biodiversity is better addressed?	No	If yes, list the organizations or businesses and list the changes applicable to each
Do these changes affect the business efficiency of the organization in any way?	No	If yes, describe the costs and benefits – in financial terms – to each organization listed.
Have these changes been imposed by legal or regulatory means?	No	If yes, describe the legal, regulatory or enforcement changes that brought these about.
Have these changes been driven by market considerations in any way?	No	If yes, describe the market forces which have caused these changes.
Have these changes been made as a consequence of decisions regarding corporate environmental responsibility.	No	If yes, what caused these shifts in organizational or corporate philosophy?
Were there any other causes of these changes in practice or behaviour?	No	If yes, describe them.

Please answer all questions	State: Yes, No or In- Progress	Additional Notes
Has the project taken any measures associated with adaptation to climate change?	No	If yes, what?
Does the project have a budget for activities related to dissemination?	No	If yes, how many other organizations or businesses have so far adopted any of the practices promoted by the project?
BD6: Lessons learning, dissemination, uptake		
Has the project compiled any lessons or good practices?	Yes	<p>If yes, list the subjects of these and attach these to the PIR report. Paper attached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines on Reduced Impact Harvesting (Pahang); • Manual Guidelines on Peat Forest Fire Prevention and Management (Sabah); • Berawan Fishing Regulations in Loagan Bunut (<i>Peraturan Berawan Loagan Bunut Menangkap Ikan, 2006</i>) (Sarawak); • Peatland Development and Management Guidelines for SEPPSF comprising two volumes, namely: Volume 1 'Agricultural Development and Management Guidelines'; and Volume 2 'Stateland Logging Guidelines' (Pahang)
Does the project have any demonstrations of good practice in place?	In progress	<p>If yes, list the subjects of these.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific planning process • Community building organization • Progressive awareness campaign
Have any of the lessons or demonstrations from the project been adopted elsewhere?	Yes	<p>If yes, list the subjects of these and where they have been adopted. Explain any actions taken by the project to assist in this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Pahang, the Project extends its assistance in revising the Tasek Bera Ramsar Site Management Plan. • The Pahang Forestry Department adopts an approach similar to IMP consultative process in developing the State's Forest Management Plan. • In Sabah, the IMP consultative planning process using the 5-S Framework has been adopted for the formulation of Trus Madi Forest Reserve Management Plan.

FINAL 11 July 2007

For BD6: Biosafety Projects Only

Answer all applicable questions	State: Yes, No or In- Progress	Additional Notes
Has the project resulted in the enactment of any legislation affecting biosafety?	No	If yes, explain
Has the project helped put in place any institutional arrangements to address biosafety?	No	If yes, explain
Has the project helped put in place a national biosafety framework?	No	
Has the project helped to launch the implementation of the national biosafety framework?	No	If yes, explain

FINAL 11 July 2007

Attachment 1

Dates of visits to project by UNDP country office July 2006 – September 2007

Dates	Person/s	Venue
17 August 2006	Hari Ramalu Ragavan	Pekan Forest Reserve, Pahang
21 August 2006	Hari Ramalu Ragavan	FRIM, Kepong, Selangor
8 November 2006	Hari Ramalu Ragavan	FRIM, Kepong, Selangor
21 June 2007	Hari Ramalu Ragavan	Kuching
15 January 2007	Hari Ramalu Ragavan	FRIM, Kepong, Selangor
29 June 2007	Hari Ramalu Ragavan	Kota kinabalu
05 July 2007	Hari Ramalu Ragavan	Kuantan
23 March 2007	Hari Ramalu Ragavan	FRIM, Kepong, Selangor
3 rd April 2007	Hari Ramalu Ragavan	FRIM, Kepong, Selangor
18 April 2007	Hari Ramalu Ragavan	FRIM, Kepong, Selangor
8 July 2007	Hari Ramalu Ragavan	FRIM, Kepong, Selangor
10 August 2007	Hari Ramalu Ragavan	FRIM, Kepong, Selangor