GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9872**		
Country/Region:	**Peru**		
Project Title:	**Capacity Building for Peru's transparency system for climate change mitigation and adaptation**		
GEF Agency:	**UNEP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CBIT-1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$50,000**	Project Grant:	**$1,199,000**
Co-financing:	**$700,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$1,899,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Milena Vasquez**	Agency Contact Person:	**Geordie Colville**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	MGV, August 7, 2017: Yes, the project is aligned to the CBIT Programming Directions.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV, August 7, 2017: The project is aligned with Peru's NDC and National Climate Change Strategy. Please address the comment below: 1) Please provide further details on specific coordination with the NAP process.	

[1] For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		MGV, September 19, 2017: 1) Comment cleared.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	MGV, August 7, 2017: Yes.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MGV, August 7, 2017: Yes, the project identifies very specific gaps and needs with regards to national priorities for establishing a national transparency system and informing national policy-making for which this CBIT support will be used.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MGV, August 7, 2017: Yes.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV, August 7, 2017: Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	MGV, August 7, 2017: NA, this project uses resources from the CBIT TF. There are adequate resources available in the CBIT TF.	
	• The focal area allocation?	MGV, August 7, 2017: NA, this	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		project uses resources from the CBIT TF. There are adequate resources available in the CBIT TF.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?	MGV, August 7, 2017: NA, this project uses resources from the CBIT TF. There are adequate resources available in the CBIT TF.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MGV, August 7, 2017: Not at this time. Please address comment in Box 2 and the comment below: 1) Please provide an Executing Partner under Part I of the PIF, which is currently empty. MGV, September 19, 2017: Not at this time. 1) Comment cleared. Executing Partner will be the Ministry of Environment. Please note that there are two typos in the MSP Request. The Agency Fees, as outlined in the Endorsement Letter should be $113,905; however the table under Project Information ($103,905) and Table D ($103,550) have inconsistent figures.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		MGV, September 20, 2017: All comments have been cleared. P.M. recommends CEO MSP Approval.	
Review Date	Review	August 07, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 19, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 20, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation	recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		