



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5389		
Country/Region:	Eritrea		
Project Title:	Support to Eritrea for the Revision of the NBSAPs and Development of Fifth National Report to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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:	\$220,000
Co-financing:	\$216,000	Total Project Cost:	\$436,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Esther Mwangi

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	4-30-13 Yes. Eritrea is eligible for GEF funding Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?*	4-30-13 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP in the amount of \$240,900 including Agency fees. This is the amount requested in the PIF. Cleared
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	4-30-13 Yes. Cleared
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	4-30-13 No. The oversight and monitoring of this project will be carried out from UNEP's headquarters in Nairobi. Cleared
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	4-30-13 This project will be supported with funds from the BD set-aside. Cleared
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	4-30-13 Yes. This project is aligned to the GEF 5 Strategic Goal 4 - Build national and regional capacities and enabling conditions for global environmental protection and sustainable development. Cleared
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	4-30-13 Yes. The project addresses focal area Objective Five: Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through 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?	4-30-13 Yes. Relevant information on p. 13. Cleared
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	4-30-13 Yes. As stated in the PIF, the Department of the Environment (Ministry of Land Water and Environment) is the national authority in charge of environmental matters in the country and is the agency that will follow up the recommendations made in this project. This will be done by making sure that: a) The Ministry will include a national budget for continuous monitoring of the key issues that will be recommended in the new NBSAP, b) The Ministry will ensure that GEF projects, and others funded by other donors or by the country itself will adhere to the key recommendations and outcomes from the NBSAP, and c) Members of the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) will be invited to stakeholder meetings to provide options for future collaboration on the basis of the NBSAP, CHM and 5th National Report. Cleared
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	4-30-13 Yes. The project has the following components and outputs:

		<p>2. Setting national targets, principles, & main priorities of the strategy 3. Strategy and action plan development 4. Development of Implementation plans and related activities 5. Institutional, monitoring, reporting and exchange</p> <p>The activities carried out under these 5 components will result in the revised National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and to develop the Fifth National Report (5NR) to the CBD.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	<p>4-30-13 Yes. See details p. 13. Cleared</p>
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>4-30-13 Yes. See details on page 23-24. Cleared</p>
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>4-30-13 Yes. See list of GEF-funded and GEF-non funded projects in Eritrea, Tables 1 & Table 2 starting on p. 23. Cleared</p>
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>4-30-13 Yes. See details on p. 20-22. Cleared</p>
Project Financing	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	<p>4-30-13 Yes. Cleared</p>
	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>4-30-13 Yes. It is 10% of the project cost. Cleared</p>
	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>4-30-13 Yes. Assuming the in-kind co-financing from the Government becomes effective during project implementation. Cleared</p>
	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	<p>4-30-13 Yes. It is 1:1 Cleared</p>
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	<p>4-30-13 The Agency does not need to bring co-financing for the EA</p>

	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:*	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 	

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	4-30-13 Yes. This EA is technically cleared.
Review Date (s)	First review**	April 30, 2013
	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.**