



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4513		
Country/Region:	Global (Benin, Bhutan, Central African Republic, Cape Verde, Djibouti, Dominica, Grenada, Gambia, Equatorial Guinea, Guyana, Cambodia, St. Kitts And Nevis, Lao PDR, Liberia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Maldives, Malawi, Nepal, Niue, Palau, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, Togo, Tonga, Uganda, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Vanuatu, Zambia, Congo DR)		
Project Title:	Support to GEF Eligible Parties (LDCs & SIDs) for the Revision of the NBSAPs and Development of Fifth National Report to the CBD - Phase 1		
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):	BD-5; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,798,000
Co-financing:	\$6,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$13,298,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	July 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Esther Mwangi

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	April 13, 2011 Yes, all 60 countries that may participate in this project are parties to the CBD and GEF eligible.	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	April 13, 2011 NA	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	April 13, 2011 Please submit up to 60 Letters of Endorsement whereby countries express their interest in participating in the umbrella project and receiving support from the focal area set aside to develop/revise their NBSAP and complete	

Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	April 13, 2011 Yes, UNEP has provided extensive support to these activities historically and has the capacity to implement this project.	
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	April 13, 2011 Yes, the GEF agency is providing significant amounts of cofinance for an enabling activity. Please distinguish in Table C, the amount that UNEP is providing "in-kind" and how much is "grant" funding.	
	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	April 13, 2011 Yes, UNEP has demonstrated capacity in DEPI and DELC to support the implementation of this umbrella project.	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	April 13, 2011 NA	
	• the focal area allocation?	April 13, 2011 Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	April 13, 2011 NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	April 13, 2011 NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	April 13, 2011 Yes, the funds for this umbrella project will come out of the focal area set-aside.	
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	April 13, 2011 Yes, fully aligned with objective 5.	

		Yes.	
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	April 13, 2011 Fully responds to COP guidance and the obligations of parties to revise their NBSAPs and produce their 5th National Reports.	
	11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?	April 13, 2011 Through the process of revising their NBSAPs and developing various supporting activities (i.e, resource mobilization plan, capacity development plans, etc.) the countries will identify how to sustain implementation of the action plan for biodiversity and thus sustain the outputs and outcomes of the project.	
	12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	April 13, 2011 Yes, baseline is basically the existing NBSAPs and national reports in each country that will serve as the foundation for continued activities.	
Project Design	13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	April 13, 2011 Yes.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	April 13, 2011 Yes, project framework clearly outlines the key steps that each country will need to undertake to revise their NBSAPs and produce the fifth national report.	

	15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?	April 13, 2011 Enabling activities are fully incremental and the proposed activities will build on the existing NBSAP frameworks.	
	16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?	April 13, 2011 Yes.	
	17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?	April 13, 2011 Yes, the umbrella project modality for the potential countries that may participate in the project if implemented successfully has the potential to be cost-effective.	
	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	April 13, 2011 Project will not implement on the ground interventions given that this is a planning and reporting exercise, thus, this question is not particularly germane. However, there will be social benefits achieved through the participatory nature of the proposed NBSAP revision process.	
	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	April 13, 2011 Yes, project will ensure that participatory planning models will be used in the NBSAP revision process and include indigenous peoples and incorporate gender issues as appropriate in each country.	
	20. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	April 13, 2011 All reasonable risks identified and mitigation measures are appropriate.	
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?	April 13, 2011 Yes.	

	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	April 13, 2011 Yes.	
	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	April 13, 2011 Yes, project is consistent with past support to Parties and other global support mechanisms under implementation by CBDSEC and IUCN.	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	April 13, 2011 Yes.	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	April 13, 2011 Yes, project management cost is 3%. Please adjust the dollar figure amount when budget is adjusted based on the amount of countries participating and the average cost per NBSAP/national report production.	
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?	April 13, 2011 Yes.	
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.	April 13, 2011 Indicative cofinance is adequate for enabling activities.	
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	April 13, 2011 Yes, and proposed proportions per component are sound	

		In addition, based on past support to NBSAP development and national reporting, the GEF estimates an average cost of about \$220,000 per project. Thus, please adjust the total budget envelope accordingly to reflect the delivery of up to 60 NBSAPs and 5th National Reports at an average cost of about \$220,000 per country.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	April 13, 2011 NA	
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	April 13, 2011 No. Please address all comments above and resubmit. Please secure endorsement letters from all countries wishing to participate up to a maximum of 60. Final proposed budget envelope must reflect the final number of countries agreeing to be part of the umbrella project at an average cost of \$220,000 per country. Please include under project implementation arrangements in the PIF that UNEP will provide brief quarterly updates on project implementation to CESEEC listing all countries and status	

		<p>National Report using the components in the project framework as the elements of a reporting dashboard.</p> <p>June 8, 2011</p> <p>No.</p> <p>The following countries that have been included in the submission are neither an LDC or a SID: Bahrain, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Swaziland, and Tajikistan.</p> <p>Please resubmit the proposal to support 30 LDCs and SIDs and included the endorsement letters for all thirty.</p> <p>Please note that in Appendix 1, in the middle table column the word "indicative" is misspelled.</p> <p>All other adjustments in the documentation are satisfactory.</p> <p>June 23, 2011</p> <p>Revised submission adequately addresses previous concerns.</p>	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	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.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
Secretariat Recommendation	2. Is itemized budget justified? 3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
Review Date (s)	4. Other comments	
	First review*	
	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.