



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	4833		
Country/Region:	Yemen		
Project Title:	National Biodiversity Planning to Support the Implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan in Yemen		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4847 (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:	
Co-financing:		Total Project Cost:	
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Johan Robinson

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	3-14-12 Yes. Yemen is eligible for funding. Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?*	3-14-12 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for \$220,000. Cleared
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	3-14-12 Yes. Cleared
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?*	3-14-12 Yes. As stated in the EA, "UNDP has an established national office in Sana'a with well-developed working relationships with the key stakeholders of the project. The Yemen UNDP Country Office counts on three professional staff to cater for the Environment and Energy portfolio, plus operational, senior management and support staff. The project will benefit from the presence in Slovakia of the regional UNDP Bratislava Office"

		<p>Please clarify if UNDP is currently operating in Yemen, and the probability of having to run this project from outside Yemen and relying only on local consultants to do the job on the ground (with support of International Consultants working from abroad).</p> <p>3-30-12 Addressed in the revised EA. Cleared</p>
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 STAR allocation? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	<p>3-14-12 Yes. The project is requesting \$220,000. Cleared</p>
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	<p>3-14-12 Yes. The project has the following three components: 1) Stocktaking and national target setting 2) NBSAP update (by early 2014). 3) National frameworks for NBSAP implementation, CDB reporting and exchange mechanisms (including the Fifth National Report to the CBD by 31 March 2014). Cleared</p>
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	<p>3-14-12 Yes. BD5 Objective: Integrate CBD Obligations into National Planning Processes through Enabling Activities. Cleared</p>
	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?	<p>3-14-13 Yes. Please refer to pages 13-14 of EA. Cleared</p>
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>3-14-12 Please clarify how this EA will contribute to the Institutional sustainability of the project outcomes. Most of the funds will be used for International consultants (\$450,000), national consultants (\$79,000) and contractual services (\$70,000) just to conduct the job done. This</p>

		<p>\$192,000 is 87% of the GEF request!</p> <p>3-30-12 Addressed in the revised EA. Cleared</p>
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>3-14-12 Yes. The project has the following three components: 1) Stocktaking and national target setting 2) NBSAP update (by early 2014). 3) National frameworks for NBSAP implementation, CDB reporting and exchange mechanisms (including the Fifth National Report to the CBD by 31 March 2014). Cleared</p>
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	<p>3-14-12 Yes. Please refer to page 16 of EA. Cleared</p>
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>3-14-12 Yes. Please refer to page 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>3-14-12 Yes. Cleared</p>
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>3-12-14 Yes. As stated in the Ea: "The Ministry of Water and Environment (MoWE) is the government institution responsible for the implementation of the project and will act as the Executing Agency through the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA). The EPA 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). The NPD will be technically supported by a project technical team / project technical officer (national/international) as well as UNDP's technical backstopping provided by the UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor responsible for the project and the UNDP Environment Focal Point at the Country Office". Cleared</p>
	15. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>3-14-12 Yes. It is 10% of the GEF total. Cleared</p>

Project Financing		
	16. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>3-14-12 Please clarify the following: 1) The budget for printing materials (Budget note e) (Component 1 = \$2,800 + Component 3 = \$5,000) appears to be exceedingly high. 2) The budget for upgrading the CHM appears to be missing. 3) The budget for National NBSAP Review Consultant appears in two lines (Budget notes b, and n. In Component 1, Budget Code 71300 = \$18,000, and under Component 3 = \$4,300. In Annex A, the cost is \$430/week x 10 = \$4,300. Please clarify. 4) Where in Annex D is the Group of experts in economic and development services?</p> <p>3-30-12 Addressed in the revised EA. Cleared</p>
	17. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	<p>3-14-12 The co-financing is \$78,000. It will provided by the Government of Yemen and UNDP. Cleared</p>
	18. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	<p>3-14-12 UNDP is providing \$30,000 cash. Cleared</p>
Agency Responses	19. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 	

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	20. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	3-12-12 Please address issues under items 4, 9 and 16. Thanks. 3-30-12 Yes. This EA is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review**	March 16, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 30, 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.**