



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	<b>5418</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Mauritius</b>		
Project Title:	<b>National Biodiversity Planning to Support the implementation of the CBD 2011 2020 Strategic Plan in Mauritius</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4893 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$220,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$142,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$362,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jaime Cavalier</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Fabiana Issler</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	4-30-13 Yes. Mauritius 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 dated April 8, 2013, in the amount of \$240,900 including Agency fees. 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 Yes. The project will be supported by the staff in the Country office. Technical backstopping will be provided by the UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor responsible for the project. 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"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	4-30-13 This EA is 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. Cleared
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	4-30-13 Yes. BD5 Objective: Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities. 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. As stated in the PIF, "..... the National Environmental Policy (NEP, 2008) defines the overarching environmental objectives and strategies for Government of Mauritius. The NEP in turn provides for the implementation of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP, 2006) and Forestry Policy (FP, 2006). This project is a following on to the existing NBSAP and it is consistent with it". 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. See details on how the project plans to build national capacity on pages 8 and 9 of PIF. Cleared
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	4-30-13 Yes. The project has the following components and related outcomes:  1. Stocktaking and national target setting: By early 2013 the stock-taking exercise is complete and - By mid of 2013, the Aichi Targets are developed. 2. NBSAP update: By end 2014, the Mauritius' NBSAP is fully updated and submitted to the CBD COP. 3. National frameworks for NBSAP implementation, CDR reporting

		<p>NBSAP is completed, and by mid 2015, complete the updating and improvement of national CHM.</p> <p>The activities under these 3 components will result in the revised NBSAP and 5th National Report 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</p> <p>Yes. See details on p. 20 of PIF.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>4-30-13</p> <p>Yes. See details of stakeholder involvement in project preparation on p. 17-18.</p> <p>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</p> <p>Yes. See details on p. 15-16.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>4-30-13</p> <p>Yes. UNDP is the GEF Agency for the project and accountable to the GEF for the use of funds. The project is nationally implementation (NIM), in line with the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA, 1974) between the UNDP and the Government of Mauritius, and the Country Programme Document (CPD) (2009-2011 with extension to 2012). The Ministry of Agro Industry and Food Security will be responsible for implementing project activities, functioning as the national implementation entity for the project. This implies the timely and verifiable attainment of project objectives and outcomes. The Ministry of Agro Industry and Food Security will nominate a high level official who will serve as the National Project Director (NPD) for the project implementation. The NPD will chair the Project Steering Committee (PSC), and be responsible for providing government oversight and guidance to the project implementation.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	<p>4-30-13</p> <p>Yes. Details and justification on p.3.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Project Financing		

	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	4-30-13 Yes. It is below 10% of the project cost. Cleared
	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	4-30-13 Yes. Assuming the in-kind contributions from the Government become effective during project implementation. Cleared
	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	4-30-13 The co-financing ratio is 1:0.5 Cleared
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	4-30-13 The agency brings \$2K to the project. Cleared
	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:*	
	• STAP?	
	• Convention Secretariat?	
	• Other GEF Agencies?	

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	<b>22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	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.**