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

GEF ID:	**5337**		
Country/Region:	**Sri Lanka**		
Project Title:	**Enhancing Biodiversity Conservation and Sustenance of Ecosystem Services in Environmentally Sensitive Areas**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5165 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-2;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$100,000**	Project Grant:	**$2,626,690**
Co-financing:	**$11,500,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$14,226,690**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	**June 01, 2013**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Yoko Watanabe**	Agency Contact Person:	**Doley Tshering**

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**?	Sri Lanka is eligible for GEF BD finance as it has ratified the CBD, and recipient country of WB and UNDP.	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	Yes, an endorsement letter dated 2/7/2013 signed by the OFP is attached.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, the project is within the remaining GEF-5 BD STAR allocation to Sri Lanka.	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, refer above.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or	n/a	

	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
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).*	Yes the proposal conforms with BD2 Objective 2. The objective of the project is clearly linked to Target 7 (mainstreaming in agriculture) of the Aichi Target.	
	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?	Yes, it is in line with the NBSAP and other relevant policies and strategies.	
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?	1. The global significance of biodiversity resource is described only at the national level. The PM suggests to bring the relevant description on the concerned project site, the Galoya and Kubukkan, to this section to further build the case. Further, it is important to clarify why the concerned pilot site was selected among the other four Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) identified in the country. 2. The explanation on the threats to biodiversity could be further erabolated, including the issue of overexploitation. 3. While it is understood that several national policies and laws provides the framework for establishing and managing the ESAs, it is not very clear whether	

		clarify the framework/modality. It is also not clear what these existing policies specifically state on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. At one point the proposal notes that the project will place an appropriate legal and regulatory framework (page 7), while the project description on framework is focused more on strategy and action plan (page 9). Please clarify. 4. Likewise, it is not very clear whether the existing laws and regulations clarifies the lead agency for ESAs, in addition to the development of a coordination mechanism that is identified as key project activity (page 5). Is there a clear institution, a lead agency within the MoE to ensure implementation and sustainability of the ESAs? 5. The identified baseline projects are mostly at the national scale and provides a vague and loose linkage to the proposed project. Please further elaborate and provide information on projects and initiatives that are closely linked to the proposed project. 5 April 2013 Adequate additional information provided and revision made.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	On component 1, as noted above, please further clarify the legal and regulatory framework as well as roles of the key institutions/ On component 2, the mechanism to promote and mainstream all the identified biodiversity-friendly practices on the ground is still vague and unclear. Is it	

		these identified sectors? Please further elaborate and provide additional information on the possible modalities, e.g. institutional capacities, private sector involvement, approaches, etc. Please also further clarify and build in activities to ensure both institutional and financial sustainability of the initiative, and ensure scaling up of the pilot activities at the national level. 5 April 2013 Additional information has been provided and revision has been made. On the financial sustainability, the suggested financial sustainability strategy and other activities are not currently incorporated in the project framework and description. As financial sustainability of the initiative is one of the important element for the success of this initiative in a long run, appropriate outcome, output, and description are expected in the project design. Please provide adequate revision and information. On the biodiversity-friendly practices into different sectors, while the additional information is useful, we would like to see further focus on the most appropriate sectors (e.g. agriculture and tourism) so that we can achieve tangible results. While the details may come after the PPG, at least please indicate which sector(s) maybe the primary focus of the project, and how the project will address/reduce the threats.	

	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes, adequately identified at this stage (key threatened species, habitat coverage, etc). However, please further clarify the selection criteria of the proposed project site, with a view to further maximize the global environmental benefit from the project investment.	
	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. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Please clarify whether there are indigenous peoples and territories involved in the project, and potential role in managing the ESAs with other institutions. Please also further eraborate on the roles of the CSOs as relevant.	
	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)	On climate change impact, considering that the project will be working from the ridge to shore, please provide a little more tailored impacts and measures specific to the project.	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	As noted above, information on the baseline projects need to be further eraborated, including coordination measures.	
	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	Please provide further information on all three elements.	

	likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.		
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar 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?	The project finance per component as well as cofinancing (1 to 4 ratio) are appropriate.	
	17. At PIF: 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? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	Yes, UNDP is identified to bring in $3.5 million cash cofinance to this project.	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	Yes, it is identified as less than 5%.	
	19. At PIF, 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? At CEO endorsement/ approval,		

	report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
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?**	No, please refer to the comments made above and resubmit a revised PIF with additional information and clarification. 5 April 2013 No, please refer to the further comments under item 7. Upon receipt of the revised PIF that adequately respond to the comments, the PM will recommend the PIF for future work program inclusion. 12 April 2013 Yes, the GEFSEC received a revised PIF that adequately responds to the earlier comments. The PM recommends the PIF for future work program inclusion.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		

Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
	First review*	March 22, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 05, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 2013	

* **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.**