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

GEF ID:	**5601**		
Country/Region:	**Global**		
Project Title:	**Support to GEF Eligible Countries for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 17 Through a Globally Guided NBSAPs Update Process**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP and UNEP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5283 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-5;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$1,700,000**
Co-financing:	**$2,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$3,700,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Mark Zimsky**	Agency Contact Person:	**Fabiana Issler**

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**?		October 14, 2013 NA
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?		October 14, 2013 N/A
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		October 14, 2013 N/A
	• the focal area allocation?		October 14, 2013 N/A

	equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		October 14, 2013 Yes.
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).*		October 14, 2013 Yes, this project is specifically aimed to help countries complete their NBSAPs.
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?		October 14, 2013 N/A
Project Design	6. 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?		October 14, 2013 Please address the following issues: 1. Internet connectivity - Many of these countries where these services will be used have low and/or spotty internet connectivity. Some of these tools would likely require good connections. How will the learning modules and planning tools be designed to allow for use off-line? 2. Languages - One of the current problems is that available resources are

			languages be chosen? Would any non-UN languages be considered? For documents and resources that are not going to be translated or for languages not included, have you considered using automatic translation (albeit imperfect)? Please clarify. 3. Peer-to-peer review of NBSAPs seems difficult to achieve and of limited added value given the gaps in capacity identified. Is this anticipated to be a major component of this program? How will the program ensure that peers will have enough expertise to add value in this process? October 28, 2013 Revisions have addressed these issues.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?		October 14, 2013 Yes.
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?		10/14/2013 Yes.
	9. 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?		10/14/2013 Yes.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?		10/14/2013 Yes.

	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		10/14/2013 Yes.
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		10/14/2013 Please address how this project has learned from previous capacity building and knowledge management experiences, i.e. Biodiversity Planning Support Programme. 10/28/2013 Revisions have addressed these issues.
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.		10/14/2013 This project seeks to use a relatively small investment to support the improvement in the quality of NBSAPs and develop capacity through mechanisms such as learning modules that can be re-used and translated. The expert guidance provided by the team and the roster of experts will help improve the quality of NBSAPs to make the most of the GEF's investments in these EAs. These investments will be sustained through a plan in which CBD will take over maintenance and updating.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		N/A
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative		10/14/2013 Yes.

	benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		10/14/2013 Yes.
	17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?		10/14/2013 Yes.
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?		10/14/2013 Yes.
	19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		10/14/2013 No PPG funds were used.
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		October 14, 2013 N/A
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		October 14, 2013 N/A
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that		10/14/2013 Please clarify the data that will need to

			user surveys) rather than assessments that can be done afterwards. 10/28/2013 This issue has been addressed.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**		
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		October 14, 2013 No. Please address the issues identified in this review and resubmit. October 28, 2013 Yes. All issues have been addressed.
	First review*	October 14, 2013	
Review Date (s)	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.