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:	**$49,338,351**	Total Project Cost:	**$61,998,901**
PIF Approval:	**April 28, 2015**	Council Approval/Expected:	**June 04, 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	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
	drivers[2] of global environmental 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):		
	• The STAR allocation?	March 20, 2015 Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	March 20, 2015 Yes.	

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	March 20, 2015 NA.	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	March 20, 2015 NA.	
	• 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?	March 20, 2015 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.	
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?	December 14, 2016 There were minor changes but all acceptable.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	December 14, 2016 Yes, a comprehensive design and project structure tailored to deliver outputs and achieve outcomes.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	December 14, 2016 Yes, financing plan and level of financial resources is adequate.	
	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)	December 14, 2016 Yes. Fully detailed in Annex 10.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	December 14, 2016 Yes, all cofinancing letters provided.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	December 14, 2016 Yes.	
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	December 14, 2016 NA.	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	December 14, 2016 Yes, including GEF-6 IAP on Commodities.	
	9. Does the project include a	December 14, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes, with robust logframe and indicators.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	December 14, 2016 Yes with elements of component four dedicated to KM.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	December 14, 2016 Yes.	
	• STAP	December 14, 2016 Yes.	
	• GEF Council	December 14, 2016 Yes.	
	• Convention Secretariat	December 14, 2016 NA.	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	December 14, 2016 Yes.	
Review Date	Review	December 14, 2016	
	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.