

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Peru

Basic Information

GEF ID

10592

Countries

Peru

Project Title

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Peru

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6521

GEF Focal Area(s)

Biodiversity

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

Yes. Cleared.

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 23, 2020

NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 23, 2020

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 23, 2020

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 23, 2020

NA

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

May 23, 2020

NA

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

art 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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations, and contribute to the projects/programs overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

art 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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

May 23, 2020

NA

Agency Response

EFSEC 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

May 23, 2020

Yes. Cleared. Adequate explanations provided and text revised appropriately in response to all issues raised in the first review when the project was mistakenly submitted as an FSP. Thus, the PIF is recommended for CEO 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
First Review	5/23/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The Seventh Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) in Peru, to be financed through this project, aims to enable communities and organizations in four prioritized landscapes of the Peruvian Southern Andes to undertake participatory landscape planning and management approach that will enhance socio-ecological resilience. The SGP will support community-based actions in each landscape by providing technical and financial assistance through small-scale projects implemented by local community organizations that are designed in their totality to achieve landscape-scale impacts.

Four regions have been prioritized considering criteria such as high biodiversity values (ecosystems / key forest types, endemic and threatened species, ecosystem services) that face anthropic pressures; vulnerable populations (low Human Development Index); and manageable area/scale for an efficient and effective intervention. An intervention landscape is found within each of the four regions in the Southern high Andes (between 2,800 and 5,500 masl): Arequipa, Cusco, Puno and Tacna, which together comprise a total area of 3.2 million hectares, with a population of 201,600 inhabitants (49.8% women). During the project preparation phase, the geographic scope of the intervention landscapes within these regions will be refined, including confirmation of interest of local authorities and other stakeholders.

The program's contribution to the GEF-7 core indicators will be 8,000 hectares of land restored and 30,000 hectares under improved practices to benefit globally important biodiversity that exists outside of the protected area system.