



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5013		
Country/Region:	El Salvador		
Project Title:	National Biodiversity Planning to Support the implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5010 (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:	\$220,010
Co-financing:	\$205,180	Total Project Cost:	\$425,190
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Andrew Velthaus	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	June 15, 2012 Yes, El Salvador has ratified the CBD.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?*	June 15, 2012 Endorsed on May 15, 2012.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	June 15, 2012 Yes, UNDP has the strongest comparative advantage for this.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	June 15, 2012 Yes. UNDP has a country office with two professional staff.
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	June 15, 2012 NA
	• the focal area allocation?	June 15, 2012

		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	Yes - the request is for \$220,000, matching the benchmark for NBSAP grants out of the BD FA set aside.
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	<p>June 15, 2012</p> <p>Yes. Aligned with BD objective 5.</p>
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	<p>June 15, 2012</p> <p>Yes - project will result in integration of measurable BD conservation and sustainable use targets into development and sectoral planning frameworks.</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>June 15, 2012</p> <p>It is an updating of the country's NBSAP, which is a key national strategy and action plan.</p>
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>June 15, 2012</p> <p>Yes. It will help educate decision makers on the value of ecosystem services, the country further mainstream biodiversity considerations, and incorporate ecosystem-based adaptation into development planning. It will also develop a strategy for resource mobilization to implement the NBSAP.</p>
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>June 15, 2012</p> <p>The NBSAP framework follows the CBD guidance and the GEF template for NBSAPs.</p>
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	<p>June 15, 2012</p> <p>Yes. Consistent with COP guidance, the proposal discusses how the project will treat gender as core cross-cutting issue during NBSAP revision.</p>

	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	June 15, 2012 The project intends to ensure participation by indigenous groups, particularly the four main indigenous groups in the country.
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	June 15, 2012 Yes, it mentions the relevant initiatives with which it will be coordinated.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	June 15, 2012 Yes, there is considerable detail given to how each component will be implemented, what types of consultants hired, and TORs are included for larger consultancies.
Project Financing	15. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	June 15, 2012 Yes - it is within the guidelines provided by the GEF Secretariat for NBSAP revisions.
	16. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	June 15, 2012 Each component is adequately funded. The co-financing is in kind, rather than grant, but appears adequate.
	17. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	June 15, 2012 Yes, the co-financing appears to be appropriate.
	18. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	June 15, 2012 Yes, the \$6,000 in co-financing that UNDP is bringing is in-line with its role in the country.
Agency Responses	19. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	• STAP?	NA
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	20. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	June 15, 2012 Yes.
Review Date (s)	First review**	June 15, 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.**