GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	**4987**		
Country/Region:	**Algeria**		
Project Title:	**National Biodiversity Planning to Support the implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan in Algeria**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5027 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$220,000**
Co-financing:	**$321,600**	Total Project Cost:	**$541,600**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	5-25-12 Yes. Algeria is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?*	5-25-12 Yes. There is a letter of endorsement from the OFP for $242,000 dated March 27, 2012. Cleared
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	5-25-12 Yes. Cleared
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	5-25-12 Yes. This project is in line with UNDP Algeria's Country Programme Document 2012-1014. There is a UNDP office in Algeria with three professionals working for Biodiversity and Energy. Cleared
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	

	• the focal area allocation?	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	5-25-12 Yes. Cleared
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	5-25-12 Yes. Cleared
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	5-25-12 Yes. Cleared
	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?	5-25-12 Yes. This project is in line with the SPAN of 2000 -updated in 2005, and the PNAE-DD of 2002. Cleared
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	5-25-12 Yes. Cleared
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	5-25-12 Yes. The project has the following components and outputs: 1. Stocktaking and national target setting: National targets in response to Aichi targets developed by end of 2012. 2. NBSAP update: NBSAP fully updated and submitted to COP by early 2014 3. National framework for NBSAP implementation, CBD reporting and exchange mechanisms: 5th National Report prepared and submitted by 2014. Cleared
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	5-25-12 Yes. See "Gender marker" on p. 20. Cleared

	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	5-25-12 Yes. Seethe list of Government and Non-Government institutions on p. 19-20. Cleared
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	5-25-12 Yes. Cleared
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	5-25-12 Yes. The project will be executed by the Ministry of Land Planning and Environment. Cleared
Project Financing	15. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	5-25-12 Yes. It is 10% of the project cost. Cleared
	16. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	5-25-12 Yes. Cleared
	17. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	5-25-12 Yes. There is $361,600 in co-financing, and a request of $220,000. Cleared
	18. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	5-25-12 There is $361,600 in co-financing, of which $50,000 are from UNDP. Cleared
Agency Responses	19. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	• STAP?	
	• Convention Secretariat?	
	• Other GEF Agencies?	

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	**20. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?**	5-25-12 Yes. This EA is recommended. Cleared
Review Date (s)	First review**	May 25, 2012
	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.**