



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5478		
Country/Region:	Ecuador		
Project Title:	Third National Communication (3NC) and First Biennial Update Report (BUR)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5213 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$852,000
Co-financing:		Total Project Cost:	\$852,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Yamil Bonduki

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, Ecuador is eligible to receive resources.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * ¹	A letter from the operational focal point is on file.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	UNDP has a comparative advantage for this kind of project. UNDP has extensive experience with these kinds of activities.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? *	Yes the project fits into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country.
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	
	• the focal area allocation?	
	• focal area set-aside?	
	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	Yes the resources are available from the focal area set-aside. US\$500,000 for national communications and US\$352,000 for the

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Project Consistency		biennial update report.
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	The project is aligned with the focal area results framework.
	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?	Yes the project is consistent with the Ecuador's national strategies and plans.
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear.
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	Gender considerations are taken into account in the project design.
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Public participation is taken into consideration in the project.
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes the project is consistent and coordinated with other related initiatives.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The project implementation and execution arrangements are adequate.
Project Financing	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	The proposed budget is justified.
	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The funding level for project management is appropriate.
	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The funding per objective is adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs.
	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	Co-finance is not required as the project is financed at full cost.
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	N/A
	20. Comments related to adequacy of information	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	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?	The enabling activity is cleared for inclusion in an upcoming work program.
Review Date (s)	First review**	
	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.**