



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5019		
Country/Region:	Sudan (Regional, Sudan)		
Project Title:	National Biodiversity Planning to Support the implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan in Sudan		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4852 (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:	\$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:	Mirey Atallah,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	07/02: Yes
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?*	07/02: Yes
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	07/02: Yes
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	07/02: Yes, UNDP assisted the Sudan in the preparation of its existing NBSAP and the first and third national reports to the CBD. Furthermore, UNDP has an established national office in Khartoum.
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	07/02: Yes, in the endorsement letter, Sudan requests \$242,000 (inclusive of Agency fees) for this project.
	• the focal area allocation?	07/02: N/A
	• focal area set-aside?	07/02: Yes.
	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results	07/02: Yes

Project Consistency		
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	07/02: 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?	07/02: Yes, the project is well aligned and supportive to country's national strategies including the Khartoum Declaration 2003, the Environment Policy Act 2000.
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	07/02: Yes, the Higher Council for Environment and Natural Resources is the government institution responsible for the execution of the project, and capacity development will be also carried out through workshops.
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	07/02: Yes, all activities required by COP are included such as the technology needs assesment and capacity building.
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	07/02: Yes, the project coordination will ensure that gender considerations become an integral part of the updated NBSAP.
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	07/02: Yes, the participation of indigenous and traditional groups in the project will be ensured through locally based CSOs.
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	07/02: Yes, technical synergies will be created with other projects, including the on-going NAPA and Carbon sequestration projects.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	07/02: Yes, the project coordination will ensure that gender considerations become an integral part of the updated NBSAP. A project technical team will be set-up and UNDP regional technical advisor will provide technical backstopping.
	15. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	07/02: The management cost is 7.72% of the GEF project, which is fine.

	16. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	07/02: Yes, Sudan is requesting \$242,000 (inclusive of Agency fees), which is fine.
	17. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	07/02: There is a \$100,000 co-financing from the Government of Sudan and UNDP.
	18. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	07/02: Yes, UNDP is providing \$50,000 in-kind.
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?	07/02: This EA is recommended for approval.
Review Date (s)	First review**	July 02, 2012
	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.**