



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>5080</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Peru</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Transforming Management of Protected Area/Landscape Complexes to Strengthen Ecosystem Resilience</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5152 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$8,991,434</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$50,024,504</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$59,015,938</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 01, 2012</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ian Gray</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Lyes Ferroukhi</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	August 27, 2012: Yes. CBD signed 1992. CCD ratified 1995.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	August 27, 2012: Yes. Letter from Jose Antonio Gonzalez Norris dated August 9, 2012.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	August 27, 2012: Yes. UNDP has previous experience in PA management in LAC and internationally.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	August 27, 2012: There is no NGI.	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	August 27, 2012: Yes. UNDP national office has five technical staff and technical support available through UNDP's LAC Regional Service Center.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	August 27, 2012: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	August 27, 2012: Yes. As of August 27, 2012 Peru STAR allocation stands at BD \$7,333,877 and LD \$2,770,000 remaining to be programmed.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	August 27, 2012: SFM/REDD+ incentive funds would be available, however, justification for this project is questioned (see #14).  September 06, 2012 Addressed.	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	August 27, 2012: Yes.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	August 27, 2012: BD-1, LD-3 and SFM/REDD-1 are identified and are relevant to the project.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant	August 27, 2012: Gap: links with Peru's plans relating to forest carbon are not clear. Corrective Action: Please provide	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	<p>details of how the project links with national REDD strategies in particular FCPF and FIP.</p> <p>September 06, 2012 Additional information provided. Addressed. At CEO Endorsement please provide full details of how these activities are coordinated.</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>August 27, 2012: Yes. Details of capacity building within decision makers, technical staff of MINAM, SERNAP and MINAG as well as local communities is outlined.</p>	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>August 27, 2012: No.</p> <p>Gap: - Section B1 is not concisely describing the baseline project and the problem that the project seeks to address. Over 6,5 pages a lot of information is provided that only describes the general situation in Peru and the wider project area and "barriers to the achievement of a normative solution" (?). Most of this information is not being asked for.</p> <p>- Under paragraph 31 - 32 a bullet point list of projects is provided, which however, does not constitute a comprehensive baseline for incremental reasoning. How does, e.g. the proposed project build on the Cusco Regional Reforestation Program?</p> <p>CAR: Please briefly and concisely describe the baseline project (on which</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>GEF incremental support would build) and the problems that it seeks to address.</p> <p>September 06, 2012 Additional information on baseline has been provided and links between the baseline, project alternatives and the resulting GEBs have been clarified. Addressed.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>August 27, 2012: Not fully.</p> <p>Gap: Section B2 describes the project in detail, but lacks a short incremental reasoning on how the project activities build on the baseline in terms of generating global environmental benefits</p> <p>Corrective Action: Please improve the incremental reasoning in line with comments above.</p> <p>September 06, 2012 Incremental reasoning clarified. Addressed.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>August 27, 2012: Not fully.</p> <p>The objective of the project is clear. The BD component (comp 1) and the SLM component (comp.2) contribute to this</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>objective and are sufficiently outlined at PIF stage; project preparation will work out the details further.</p> <p>Gap: The current project design does not justify additional funding through the SFM/REDD+ incentive mechanism. There are no activities beyond the planned BD and LD funded activities that generate an added value for forests and would require additional funding. The benefits of avoided deforestation and increased carbon sinks follow in the wake of the implementation of the BD activities in the Protected areas and the SLM activities in the bufferzones. This automatic generation of benefits is not sufficient to justify SFM/REDD+ funding.</p> <p>Corrective Action: Reconsider the application for SFM/REDD+ funding or re-design the project in a way that it is fully in line with the GEF SFM/REDD+ strategy.</p> <p>September 06, 2012 Component 2 has been revised in the framework and the text clarifying the SFM/REDD elements. Addressed.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>August 27, 2012: Not fully See #14 above.</p> <p>September 06, 2012 Addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	August 27, 2012: Yes. Sufficient at PIF stage. A fuller description of how local communities will be impacted by the project will be expected at CEO Endorsement.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	August 27, 2012: Yes. Sufficient at PIF stage. More information will be required at later stages, in particular on the role of local communities within PA and buffer zone planning and implementation of activities.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	August 27, 2012: Yes. Sufficient at PIF stage.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	August 27, 2012: Yes. Sufficient detail provided at PIF stage.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	August 27, 2012: Yes. Key organizations are named in the PIF with brief descriptions of their involvement in the project. As the roles of Regional and Municipal governments are important in terms of natural resource planning and management, fuller description of these organizations responsibilities will be expected at CEO Endorsement.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	August 27, 2012: Yes. PMC is at 5%.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	August 27, 2012: Yes. Funding appears appropriate for the activities planned.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	August 27, 2012: Adequate. Cofinance stands at \$50.02 million which gives a ratio of 1:5.56.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	August 27, 2012: Yes. UNDP is providing \$6 million in grant-based cofinance, equivalent to 11% of total cofinancing.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	August 27, 2012 Not at this stage. Please address issues identified above.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		September 06, 2012 All issues addressed. This PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming work program.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	September 06, 2012 1. Coordination between ongoing initiatives including GEF-funded projects, especially in the forest and REDD sectors. 2. Socio-economic impacts on local communities. 3. The involvement and role of local communities in planning and implementation. 4. The roles of Regional and Municipal Governments in implementation	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 27, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 06, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------



PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	September 06, 2012 Yes. Proposed activities are in line with the components of the PIF. Key PPG activities are: 1. Validation and baseline analyses of target sites and ecosystems 2. Analysis of national and local capacities 3. Consultation on the project elements and implementation arrangements.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	September 06, 2012 A budget is available and costs are in line with PPG activities.
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	September 06, 2012 Yes, pending PIF inclusion in an upcoming work program.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 06, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.