



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

GEF ID:	<b>9044</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Peru</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Peru</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5497 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$91,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$3,196,672</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$3,801,742</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$7,089,414</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>April 28, 2015</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 01, 2015</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Nick Remple</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	<p>Yes. The proposed project is aligned with the GEF-6 strategic objectives approved for the GEF SGP, particularly with the following: (a) Community Landscape and Seascape Conservation; and (b) Climate Smart Innovative Agro-ecology</p> <p>The project is also aligned with the results framework of the GEF's Biodiversity Focal Area and the Climate Change FAs.</p> <p>Cleared 03/11/2015</p>
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>Yes. The project is consistent with national priorities and plans, such as the Plan Bicentenario (Bicentennial Plan), Peru's National Biodiversity (2021) and Action Plan (2014-2018) and the National Climate Change</p>

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		Strategy among others.  Cleared 03/11/2015
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>To some extent.</p> <p>a) Regarding the drivers of environmental degradation: The project indicates that the major problem to be addressed is the ongoing weakness of collective action by civil society to build and maintain the resilience of socio-ecological landscapes in rural areas of Peru, primarily owing to the organizational weaknesses of smallholder communities. This is a capacity problem. However, the PIF does not make clear what are the underlying causes of the degradation of ecosystems in Tumbes-Piura-Lambayeque Dry forest ecoregion and the Southern Cordillera. Furthermore, the PIF does not explain what the degradation consists of.</p> <p>Please provide additional information and clarification.</p> <p>b) Once this is reviewed, please explain how the components and outputs are geared at addressing the drivers of environmental degradation.</p> <p>There are some proposed sustainability, market transformation, innovative and scaling measures i.e. the landscape policy platforms, the upscaling of proven technologies, systems or practices based on knowledge gained from analysis of community innovations from past experience and using APEPROECO, to achieve economies of scale and weight in the market. These measures are clear.</p> <p>Please address comments a) and b) above. 03/11/2015</p>

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>Revised PIF addresses the threats to ecosystems in the two selected areas and drivers of environmental degradation. It also includes a more detailed explanation of how the project components and outputs address those drivers.</p> <p>Cleared 03/24/2015</p>
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>Once the drivers are identified, please review the baseline and the alternative scenario as well as the incremental reasoning of the project.</p> <p>03/11/2015</p> <p>Provided. Cleared 03/24/2015</p>
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>Yes. However, once the drivers of environmental degradation have been explained, the outcomes and outputs may need to be revised.</p> <p>03/11/2015</p> <p>Cleared 03/24/2015</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Cleared 03/11/2015</p>
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>Yes. 3.6 million from Peru's STAR allocation for GEF-6 as follows:</p> <p>BD: \$2,676,138 CC: \$923,862</p> <p>Both inclusive of agency fees.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		Cleared 03/11/2015
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>Not yet.</p> <p>In addition to the comments above, please use the most up to date template for FSPs dated January 2015 and found at:  <a href="http://www.thegef.org/gef/guidelines_templates">http://www.thegef.org/gef/guidelines_templates</a>.</p> <p>03/11/2015</p> <p>Project is recommended for Work Program inclusion.</p> <p>03/24/2015</p>
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 05, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 24, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
	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?	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:	
	• GEFSEC	
	• STAP	
	• GEF Council	
	• Convention Secretariat	
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	

<sup>3</sup> 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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
<b>Recommendation</b>		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	