

[Home RoadMap](#)

# Sustainable Multiple Use Landscape Consortia - Vertentes Project

**Review PIF and Make a recommendation**

## **Basic project information**

**GEF ID**

10468

**Countries**

Brazil

**Project Name**

Sustainable Multiple Use Landscape Consortia - Vertentes Project

**Agencies**

World Bank

**Date received by PM**

1/11/2020

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Pascal Martinez

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## **PIF**

### **Part I – Project Information**

#### **Focal area elements**

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

#### **Agency Response**

**Indicative project/program description summary**

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

The STAR allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

The focal area allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

January 13, 2020

Yes, the PPG amount requested is within the allowable cap. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

Core indicators

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Project/Program taxonomy

**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Part II – Project Justification

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**



**Agency Response**

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**Risks**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

## **Agency Response**

### **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

## **Agency Response**

### **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

## **Agency Response**

### **Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

### **Agency Response**

#### **Part III – Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**January 13, 2020**

Yes but there seems to be a typo in the Letter of Endorsement, where the PPG resources coming from the FOLUR IP incentive is \$30 higher than in the Portal. As long as the amount endorsed is higher than the actual budget used, it could be accepted but in the Letter, the sums of “PPG” and “Total” columns are incorrect. Please provide either a new and corrected letter of Endorsement OR an email from the OFP explaining it is a typo and simply confirming the right numbers.

**February 21, 2020**

The IA informed it has requested a clarification to the OFP about the typo in the LoE. Considering the difficulty to obtain a quick response, the need for the project to move forward and the very little amount of the typo (\$30), GEF Secretariat proposes to accept the PPG request as it is while waiting for the clarification from the OFP.

### **Agency Response**

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**January 13, 2020**

The PPG request is not yet recommended for clearance. Please address the comment above.

**February 21, 2020**

The PPG request is now recommended for clearance.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Review Dates**

**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**

<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

undefined