



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

GEF ID:	9387		
Country/Region:	Peru		
Project Title:	Sustainable Productive Landscapes in the Peruvian Amazon		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5629 (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; BD-4 Program 10; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-1; SFM-3; CCM-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$231,055	Project Grant:	\$18,346,927
Co-financing:	\$129,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$147,577,982
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Lyes Ferroukhi, Senior Technical Advisor, EBD

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		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental		

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)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		
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? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 			
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?		
Review Date	Review		
	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?	July 14, 2017 Changes have been made that are fully justified and result from the project design process.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	July 14, 2017 Yes, adequate design to achieve the project outcomes.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	July 14, 2017 Yes, financing is adequate with robust cofinance.	
	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)	July 14, 2017 Risks clearly identified and adequate mitigation measures developed.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	July 14, 2017 Yes, with robust cash cofinancing from key partners.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	July 14, 2017 Yes and correctly completed.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	July 14, 2017 NA.	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	July 14, 2017 Yes, with adequate coordination mechanisms identified.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	July 14, 2017 Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	July 14, 2017 Yes, fully elaborated.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	July 14, 2017 Yes.	
	• STAP	July 14, 2017 Yes.	
	• GEF Council	July 14, 2017 Yes.	
	• Convention Secretariat	July 14, 2017 NA.	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	July 14, 2017 Yes.	
Review Date	Review	July 14, 2017	
	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.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		