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

GEF ID:	**9339**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Brazil, Colombia, Peru)**		
Project Title:	**AMAZON Coordination Technical Assistance**		
GEF Agency:	**World Bank**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**159233 (World Bank)**
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; SFM-4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$137,615**	Project Grant:	**$5,000,000**
Co-financing:	**$20,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$25,137,615**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Mark Zimsky**	Agency Contact Person:	**Karin Shepardson**

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 degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and		

[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
	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):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?	November 19, 2015 The fee request for the PPG is greater than 10% of the total PPG. Please revise to 10%. January 6, 2015 PPG figures have been corrected.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?	November 19, 2015 The fee request for the PPG is greater than 10% of the total PPG. Please revise to 10%.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		January 6, 2015 PPG figures have been corrected.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	November 19, 2015 No. The fee request for the PPG is greater than 10% of the total PPG. Please revise to 10%. January 6, 2015 PPG figures have been corrected.	
Review Date	Review	November 19, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 06, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments

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?	June 21, 2017 No significant changes have been presented.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	June 21, 2017 Yes, this is a well-designed and conceptualized coordination project.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	June 21, 2017 Yes, there is adequate financing, including robust cofinancing, to achieve the project objectives.	
	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)	June 21, 2017 Risk assessment and mitigation strategy are both satisfactory.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	June 21, 2017. Yes, cofinacing is confirmed and letter provided.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	June 21, 2017 This is a coordination project to support the implementation of the ASL program and the associated child projects, therefore, a tracking tool is not required.	
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	June 21, 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?	June 21, 2017 Yes, the project is obviously coordinated with the child projects and has established a mechanism for appropriate coordination with ACTO.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	June 21, 2017 Yes and fully described under Component Two.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	June 21, 2017 Yes with a fully developed communications and knowledge management strategy.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	June 21, 2017 NA.	
	• STAP	June 21, 2017 Yes, adequate response provided.	
	• GEF Council	June 21, 2017 Yes, adequate response provided.	
	• Convention Secretariat	June 21, 2017 NA.	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	June 21, 2017	

[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
		Yes.	
Review Date	Review	June 21, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		