



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5888		
Country/Region:	Bolivia		
Project Title:	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan		
GEF Agency:	IADB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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:	\$440,000
Co-financing:	\$100,000	Total Project Cost:	\$540,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Fernando Balacazar

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes. Bolivia has signed and ratified the CBD.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * ¹	6/10/2014 Yes. It was signed by OFP on June 3, 2014 for a total of \$481,800 (project - \$440,000).
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	6/10/14 No. Please add a description of IDB's comparative advantage with regards to NBSAP development and oversight in Bolivia. 6/12/14 Adequate.

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
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	6/10/2014 No. Please provide information on IDB's activities in Bolivia. 6/12/14 Adequate.
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	6/10/2014 Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	6/10/2014 Yes.
	• focal area set-aside?	6/10/2014 Yes.
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	6/10/2014 Yes.
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	6/10/2014 No. Please add this information. 6/12/14 Adequate.
	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?	6/10/2014 Yes, as it will help develop these priorities.
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	6/10/2014 No. Please clarify which institution will be responsible for the maintenance and updating of the CHM website.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		6/12/14 Adequate explanation on how this will be addressed during project implementation.
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	6/10/2014 Sparsely adequate.
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	6/10/2014 Sparsely adequate.
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	6/10/2014 No. Please embellish the description of the roles that will be played by the various CSOs listed and indigenous groups. 6/12/14 Adequate.
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	6/10/2014 No. It is unclear how this project will work with existing GEF projects and other relevant initiatives, such as major bilateral donors.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	6/10/2014 Sparsely adequate.
Project Financing	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	6/10/2014 No. Please provide an itemized budget, currently the only expenditures allocated are the staff costs. 6/12/14 Adequate.
	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	6/10/2014 Yes. It's in line with guidance.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	6/10/2014 Probably, but without more detail in the budget it is difficult to say.
	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	6/10/2014 Yes.
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	6/10/2014 We note that there is no co-financing from IDB.
	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?	6/10/2014
		No. Please make the revisions outlined and resubmit within one day to be considered for GEF-5.
		6/12/14
		Yes.
Review Date (s)	First review**	June 10, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 12, 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.**