



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	4965		
Country/Region:	Egypt		
Project Title:	National Biodiversity Planning to Support the implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan in Egypt		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4864 (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:	\$310,000	Total Project Cost:	\$530,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	4-26-12 Yes. Egypt is eligible. Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?*	4-26-12 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for \$242,000 (including fees) dated 9-2-12 Cleared
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	4-26-12 Yes. Cleared
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	4-26-12 UNDP has a Country Co-operation Framework for Egypt (2002-2006). As stated in the EA, "UNDP has an established national office in Cairo with well-developed working relationships with the key stakeholders of the project. At least 9 professional staff and 5 support staff are directly in charge of the environment portfolio, in addition to senior management and operation support. Moreover, the project will benefit from the presence of a UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor

		Slovakia". Cleared
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	NA
	• the focal area allocation?	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	4-26-12 Yes. Egypt is requesting \$220,000 and is within the limits suggested by the GEF. Cleared
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	4-26-12 Yes. Cleared
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	4-26-12 Yes. Page 9 of EA. 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?	4-26-12 Yes. See p. 17 of EA (the National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP, 2002) defines the overarching environmental objectives and strategies for the Government of Egypt. It in turn provides for the implementation of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP version 1, 1998)". Cleared
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	4-26-12 Yes. See pages 16-17 of EA. Cleared
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	4-26-12 The EA is structured as follows:

		<p>in line with the global Aichi Targets are developed and agreed upon by early 2012.</p> <p>2) NBSAP review and update, and adoption by the Egyptian Government: The NBSAP is adopted by early 2014.</p> <p>3) National frameworks for NBSAP implementation, CBD reporting and appropriate CHM exchange mechanisms: By 2014, the 5th National Report is prepared and submitted, and the CHM is upgraded and fully operating by early 2014.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	<p>4-26-12</p> <p>Yes. See pages 20-21 of EA.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>4-26-12</p> <p>Yes. See pages 20 of EA.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>4-26-12</p> <p>Yes. Please see pages 17-18 of EA.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>4-26-12</p> <p>Yes. As stated in the EA (p. 18): "The Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency (EEAA) through its Department of Nature Conservation/National Biodiversity Unit) is the government institution responsible for the implementation of the project and will act as the Executing Agency"</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Project Financing	15. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>4-26-12</p> <p>Yes. It is 10%</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	16. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>4-26-12</p> <p>Yes. The co-financing ratio for Project Management is 1:3, twice the ratio of the total project cost.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	17. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	<p>4-26-12</p> <p>Yes. The co-financing ratio is 1:1.4</p>

	18. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	4-26-12 UNDP is not providing co-financing to this project. 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?	4-26-12 Yes. The EA is recommended for approval. Cleared
Review Date (s)	First review**	April 26, 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.**