



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	4863		
Country/Region:	Ecuador		
Project Title:	National Biodiversity Planning to Support the Implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4828 (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:	\$251,442
Co-financing:	\$443,558	Total Project Cost:	\$695,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Helen Negret

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	March 21, 2012 Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * ¹	March 21, 2012 Yes.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	March 21, 2012 Yes. UNDP has extensive experience in the development of the first generation of NBSAPs and providing technical support in this area.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? *	March 21, 2012 Yes. And country office is dedicating considerable cash and in-kind resources to the oversight and implementation of the project.
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that	

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
	apply):	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Yes. Ecuador is seeking a small amount from its STAR, \$25,000, to complement the FAS contribution. Please note comments under project financing.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Yes. Ecuador is seeking \$275,000 from the FAS. Please note comments under project financing.</p>
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Yes. Project is aligned with objective 5 of the GEF BD strategy.</p>
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	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?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Yes. It builds upon and complements previous strategic planning exercises.</p>
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Yes, through the design and implementation plan of this project, sufficient capacity should be created to ensure actual implementation of the resulting NBSAP.</p>
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Yes. The framework is adequate and adheres to the basic approaches and steps required to revise an NBSAP per the new CBD strategic plan.</p>
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Yes through UNDP gender marking methodology.</p>
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Please identify the CSOs and NGOs that will be part of the stakeholder</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>involvement as described on page 19, para 44.</p> <p>April 9, 2012</p> <p>Adequate response provided.</p>
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Yes it appears so, but please note how NGO and CSO community will be involved.</p> <p>April 9, 2012</p> <p>Adequate response provided.</p>
Project Financing	15. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Please correct project management costs to 10% exactly.</p> <p>April 9, 2012</p> <p>Adequate response provided.</p>
	16. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>The project exceeds the cost benchmarks significantly (23%) and the justification is not adequate. Please reduce the budget provided by GEF.</p> <p>April 9, 2012</p> <p>Adequate response provided.</p>
	17. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	18. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>A remarkable amount of cofinance (\$120,000) is being put forward by</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		UNDP.
Agency Responses	19. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	March 21, 2012 NA.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 	March 21, 2012 NA.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 	March 21, 2012 NA.

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	20. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>No. Please address the minor comments noted above. In addition, reduce the GEF contribution in line with the original cost benchmarks.</p> <p>April 9, 2012</p> <p>Adequate responses provided to first review. EA clearance is being recommended.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review**	March 21, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 09, 2012
	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.**