



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5631		
Country/Region:	South Sudan		
Project Title:	National Biodiversity Planing to Support the Implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan in South Sudan by Development of the first National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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:	\$220,000
Co-financing:	\$100,000	Total Project Cost:	\$320,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Alice Ruhweza

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	12-9-13 Yes. South Sudan is eligible for GEF funding. SS is a UN member. Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?*	12-9-13 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for \$240,900 dated July 25, 2013. Cleared
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	12-9-13 Yes. See details in page 15. Cleared
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	12-9-13 UNDP has an established national office in Juba. UNDP has field offices in all 10 States across South Sudan that are in contact with a diverse group of stakeholders on a day-to-day basis. 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"> • the STAP allocation? 	N/A

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	12-9-13 Yes. There are funds in the BD set aside for this project. Cleared
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	12-9-13 Yes. BD5; Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities. Cleared
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	12-9-13 Yes. BD5; 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?	12-9-13 Yes. The National Environmental Policy (NEP, 2012), the Draft National Forestry Policy (NFP, 2012) and the national forestry act, The wildlife conservation policy and wildlife act, The agriculture policy and sub policies and The land policy. Cleared
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	12-9-13 Yes. The proposed activities will assist building institutional capacities at the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development. Cleared
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	12-9-13 Yes. The project has the following components and outcomes: Component 1. Stocktaking and national target setting : The national biodiversity targets are developed in response to the global Aichi Targets by means of a participatory stocktaking exercise on biodiversity planning. Component 2. NBSAP development. The NBSAP is developed and it fully integrates new aspects of the CBD strategic plan, such as mainstreaming and anchoring the implementation of the plan into national development frameworks valuing ecosystem services and

		<p>Component 3. National frameworks for NBSAP implementation, CBD reporting and exchange mechanisms: National frameworks for resource mobilization, Convention reporting and exchange mechanisms are established.</p> <p>Clear</p>
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	<p>12-9-13 Yes. See pages 16-17 of EA. Cleared</p>
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>12-9-13 Yes. See pages 16 of EA. Cleared</p>
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>12-9-13 Yes. See pages 14 of EA. Cleared</p>
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>12-9-13 The Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, in its capacity as the focal institution for the CBD in South Sudan, will be the lead national institution to work with UNDP in the preparation of NBSAP. In line with the standard management arrangements structure for UNDP assisted projects in South Sudan, a Project Board (National Project Steering Committee “NPSC”) consisting of UNDP, the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, and the GEF Operational Focal Point will be formed that will oversee and be responsible for the policy level decision making during the NBSAP process. Cleared</p>
Project Financing	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	<p>12-9-13 Yes. Cleared</p>
	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>12-9-13 Yes. It is 10%. Cleared</p>
	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>12-9-13 Yes. There is co-financing from the GoSS and UNDP in the amount of \$100,000.</p>

	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	12-9-13 Yes. Cleared
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	12-9-13 Yes. There is co-financing from UNDP in the amount of \$30,000 in cash. 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	22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	12-9-13 Yes. Cleared
Review Date (s)	First review**	December 09, 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.**