GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	**4808**		
Country/Region:	**Peru**		
Project Title:	**Updating the National Biodiversity Strategy and Developing the Action Plan to Support the Implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**4835 (UNDP)**
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:	**$320,000**
Co-financing:	**$344,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$664,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Mark Zimsky**	Agency Contact Person:	**Lyes Ferroukhi**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	February 8, 2012 Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?*[1]	February 8, 2012 Yes in a letter dated December 26, 2011.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	February 8, 2012 Yes, UNDP has a long history on NBSAP development worldwide and a GEF biodiversity portfolio in the country.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	February 8, 2012 UNDP has senior environmental officer on staff in Lima office and support staff in Regional Office in Panama that should facilitate project implementation and supervision.

[1] Questions 2, 3, 4, 18 and 19 are applicable only to EAs submitted through Agencies.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	February 8, 2012 Yes, Peru is dedicating $100,000 from its STAR.
	• the focal area allocation?	February 8, 2012 Yes.
	• focal area set-aside?	February 8, 2012 Yes, Peru is seeking $220,000 from the FAS
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	February 22, 2012 Yes.
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	February 22, 2012 Yes.
	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?	February 22, 2012 Yes.
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	February 22, 2012 Yes.
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	February 8, 2012 Yes, clearly presented and consistent with a comprehensive NBSAP process.
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	February 8, 2012 Yes.
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	February 8, 2012 Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	February 8, 2012 Yes, builds on previous strategy development processes and complements existing initiatives.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	February 8, 2012 Yes, with correct institutions in country responsible for implementation.
Project Financing	15. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	February 8, 2012 yes.
	16. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	February 8, 2012 Yes, for the most part. Please clarify, withing the budgeted M&E table E, what costs are being borne by the GEF. Please also clarify what is meant by the note that "these costs are part and parcel of the project budget." Finally, please explain why the printing costs of the terminal report are $1,000 as the detailed budget in Annex D looks like the $1000 covers more than just the terminal report, hence the number in Table E is likely incorrect.
	17. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	February 8, 2012 Yes.
	18. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	February 8, 2012 Yes.
Agency Responses	19. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	• STAP?	
	• Convention Secretariat?	
	• Other GEF Agencies?	

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	**20. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?**	February 8, 2012 Please respond to the issues raised above in Question 16 and clarify accordingly with regards to the M&E budget and resubmit. February 22, 2012 Yes.
Review Date (s)	First review**	February 08, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 22, 2012
	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.**