



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

GEF ID:	9055		
Country/Region:	Ecuador		
Project Title:	Sustainable Development of the Ecuadorian Amazon: Integrated Management of Multiple Use Landscapes and High Value Conservation Forests		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5606 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$198,000	Project Grant:	\$12,462,550
Co-financing:	\$49,338,350	Total Project Cost:	\$61,998,900
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Helen Negret

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	March 20, 2015 Yes, project is aligned with the appropriate BD, LD and SFM objectives and results frameworks.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	March 20, 2015 Yes, it is fully consistent.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental	March 20, 2015	

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
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes, a comprehensive problem statement is presented and elements of sustainability, market transformation, scalability and innovation are adequately supported. Project uses many of similar approaches and tools being applied in the commodities IAP with clear linkage to the knowledge management component of the IAP.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	March 20, 2015 Incremental reasoning is sound.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	March 20, 2015 Yes, very robust and detailed Table B, very clear and detailed.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	March 20, 2015 Yes, fully considered with indigenous people central to many elements of project implementation.	
Availability of Resources	7. 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? 	March 20, 2015 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	March 20, 2015 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of 	March 20, 2015	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	equitable access	NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	March 20, 2015 NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	March 20, 2015 NA.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>March 20, 2015</p> <p>Yes the project is technically cleared for a future work program. The importance of commodities-driven deforestation and prioritization the GoE's response is made very clear in the PIF. Concentration of STAR resources is welcomed and maximization of Ecuador's utilization of the SFM incentive on this issue would be encouraged.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 23, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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 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. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> 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?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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.