



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

GEF ID:	4623		
Country/Region:	Global (Afghanistan, Antigua And Barbuda, Angola, Barbados, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Kiribati, Comoros, St. Lucia, Lesotho, Marshall Islands, Mali, Myanmar, Mozambique, Niger, Nauru, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Sao Tome and Principe, Chad, Timor Leste, Tanzania, Samoa)		
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 II		
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:	\$6,118,200
Co-financing:	\$5,083,637	Total Project Cost:	\$11,201,837
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 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?	<p>September 6, 2011</p> <p>Yes, all 22 countries that may participate in this project are parties to the CBD and GEF eligible. Please note that up to 30 countries can participate in this phase of the project, please advise if more countries will participate.</p> <p>September 19, 2011</p> <p>All 26 countries are eligible.</p>	

		All 27 countries are eligible.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>September 6, 2011</p> <p>Yes, all 22 countries have included an endorsement letter.</p> <p>September 19, 2011</p> <p>Yes, all 26 countries have endorsed their participation in the project.</p> <p>September 20, 2011</p> <p>Yes, all 27 countries have endorsed their participation in the project.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	<p>September 6, 2011</p> <p>Yes, UNEP has provided extensive support to these activities historically and has the capacity to implement this project.</p>	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>September 6, 2011</p> <p>Yes, UNEP has demonstrated capacity in DEPI and DELC to support the implementation of this umbrella project.</p>	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	September 6, 2011	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	September 6, 2011  Yes, the funds for this umbrella project will come out of the focal area set-aside.	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	September 6, 2011  Yes, fully aligned with objective 5.  Please note, however, that the budget figures in Table A are incorrect.  The indicative grant amount should be 4,840,000 if 22 countries are each receiving a maximum of \$220,000. The subtotal should be the same.  Please then adjust all calculations in Table A, B, and D accordingly.  September 19, 2011  Project has been revised correctly for the participation of 26 countries.  September 20, 2011  Project has been revised correctly for the participation of 27 countries.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	September 6, 2011  Yes.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and	September 6, 2011  Fully responds to COP guidance and the	

	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	NBSAPs and produce their 5th National Reports.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	September 6, 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.	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	September 19, 2011  Yes.	
Project Design	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	September 19, 2011  Yes.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	September 6, 2011  Yes, project framework clearly outlines the key steps that each country will need	

		produce the fifth national report.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	September 19, 2011 Yes.	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	September 6, 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.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	September 6, 2011 Yes.	
	18. 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)	September 19, 2011 Yes.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	September 6, 2011 Yes, project is consistent with past support to Parties and other global support mechanisms under implementation by CBDSEC and IUCN.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	September 6, 2011 Yes.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		

Project Financing	management cost appropriate?	<p>Project management cost is 3%. Please adjust the dollar figure amount when budget is adjusted as there is an error the focal area strategy framework as noted above.</p> <p>September 19, 2011</p> <p>Project budget has been corrected.</p> <p>September 20, 2011</p> <p>Project budget has been corrected to include 27 countries.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>September 6, 2011</p> <p>Yes, please however note the errors in the budget presentation as referenced in review question 6 above.</p> <p>September 20, 2011</p> <p>All corrected.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>September 6, 2011</p> <p>Indicative confinance is adequate for enabling activities.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>September 6, 2011</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		

	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>September 6, 2011</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Please revise the budget numbers in Table A, B, and D as noted above.</p> <p>In addition, please try and include 8 more countries to reach the 30 country maximum.</p> <p>September 19, 2011</p> <p>UNEP was able to increase the level of participation to 26 countries. PIF is being recommended for clearance.</p> <p>September 20, 2011</p> <p>UNEP was able to increase the level of participation to 27 countries. PIF is being recommended for clearance.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 06, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 19, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 20, 2011	
	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.**

**REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL**

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