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

GEF ID:	**9770**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, Suriname, Venezuela)**		
Project Title:	**Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme to ensure Integrated and Sustainable Management of the Transboundary Water Resources of the Amazon River Basin Considering Climate Variability and Change.**		
GEF Agency:	**UNEP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**IW-1 Program 2; IW-2 Program 3; IW-2 Program 4; BD-4 Program 10; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-1 Program 1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$300,000**	Project Grant:	**$11,735,780**
Co-financing:	**$108,501,713**	Total Project Cost:	**$120,237,493**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Christian Severin**	Agency Contact Person:	**Isabelle Van der Beck**

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]	17th of March 2017 (cseverin): Yes, however, please strengthen alignment with Aichi targets. 28th of March 2017 (cseverin): Please make sure to include the mentioning of the Aichi targets in the Project framework (table B) as has been done for the SDGs.	

[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
		3rd of October 2017 (cseverin): Addressed	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	17th of March 2017 (cseverin): It seems so, but please submit the SAP including national Ministerial endorsements, as well as all endorsement letters for the project itself. 28th of March 2017 (cseverin): Some national SAP endorsement letters are not on relevant ministerial level, please submit those. Moreover, please ensure that these national SAP endorsements are translated to English to ensure full transparency. Further, please ensure that all Project endorsement letters are included in the submission. Bolivia seems to be missing, and Venezuela appears to have forgotten to include IW funding in their endorsement letter. Please address and resubmit. 7th of April 2017 (cseverin): Please forward ministerial endorsement letters from relevant environmental ministries of the Strategic Action Programme from ALL participating countries. Further, please forward Endorsement letter of proposed project from	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Bolivia. Being an upstream country this is particular sensitive and therefore needed. The proposed solution on acquiring a revised endorsement letter from Venezuela during PPG is recognized as a pragmatic solution. Finally, in order to ensure full transparency, please forward the Strategic Action Program that the proposed project is to be implementing, so that we can have this as a reference in the project database, along with the project itself. 3rd of October 2017 (cseverin):Please during PPG ensure to acquire following: 1) Endorsements of the Strategic Action Program at ministerial level from Bolivia. If this is not provided, Bolivia can not participate in the SAP implementation project. 2) English translation of the SAP endorsements 3) Ensure that the opportunities for cooperation and synergies in particular between the Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program and the proposed investment will be fully analyzed and avenues for	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		collaboration be identified, both on technical as well as political level to facilitate successful implementation of the Basin wide SAP and subsequent uptake in the political discourse.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	17th of March 2017 (cseverin): Yes, but please substantial increase the description of entry points for the private sector towards increasing sustainability. 28th of March 2017 (cseverin): Partly addressed, please expand section inserted in 1.6 to describe the engagement mechanisms envisioned. Currently 1.6 is only outlining the sectors, but omitting to describe how they will be involved. 7th of April 2017 (cseverin):addressed	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	17th of March 2017 (cseverin): The Incremental Reasoning seems to confuse the baseline investments with co-finance. Please strengthen the argument on what the baseline will be funding and how the gef financing along with the co-financing will be an increment to the baseline. Considering the private sector	

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		engagement in fisheries in the Amazon, it seems a bit odd that the private sector does not appear to be a project partner. 28th of March 2017 (cseverin): The incremental reasoning section is to lay out the national and regional ongoing initiatives that the proposed investment will be building on and identify what additionally the GEF funding will be bringing to the region. The text mentions the closed GEF funded Amazon IWRM TDA/SAP project as the "most important baseline". Sure the project will be implementing the SAP, but that project can not be a baseline. The baseline consists of national and regional ONGOING investments that the proposed investment will be building on. Please reformulate/restructure and in the process ensure to include the GEF6 Amazon program, both in baseline as well in general throughout the project, where relevant. 7th of April 2017 (cseverin):Addressed	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	17th of March 2017 (cseverin): Partly, please address below points: 1) Please revise the Project Objective,	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		it is not very clear as what the project will be delivering. 2) The proposed SGP funding of 1 mio, and how the mechanism of this will be delivered has not been described, please include. Further, some proof from national SGP portfolios also needs to be included. 3) Please describe how the data-sharing agreement will be established in the basin and how/where the actual data management hub will be hosted. 4) table B is highlighting a range of SAP SAs, but it omits specificity in terms of outputs. Please elaborate and add more specifics, which should be fairly easy, considering this is a SAP implementation project. 5) Updating a SAP that has just been formulated and adopted seems a bit odd and out of scope of a SAP implementation project. Please explain why this is needed at this time. 6) in general the results framework seems to miss tangible delivery and stress reduction, which needs to be more in focus considering this is a SAP implementation project. 28th of March 2017 (cseverin): Partly Addressed. Comment 4 and 6 seems to have only been vaguely addressed. Please include more tangible	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		deliverables, including stress reduction, considering this is a SAP implementation project. 7th of April 2017 (cseverin):Above comments addressed, however, one comment that require clarification was not included at the initial review (a mere oversight) and hence needs to be addressed at this time: From reading the activities described under component 3 it is unclear if the project proposes to be funding hydro-metereological monitoring system stations. If this is the case, please note that GEF does NOT fund national hydromet stations, but GEF can fund regional data management and information systems. 5th of October (cseverin): Addressed	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	17th of March 2017 (cseverin): Please ensure to reflect upon how the project will be delivering towards the GEF Gender Indicators. Further, it is seems odd, that indigenous people will not be part taking in the project, considering how essential local indigenous groups is for management of the Amazonian resources. If indigenous groups will	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		be participating, please make sure to check the box, and elaborate on their importance in the project design and implementation. 28th of March 2017 (cseverin):Above comment partly addressed. Please ensure to make reference to the GEF6 Core Gender Indicators in PIF in section 3 and how the project will be delivering along these. 7th of April 2017 (cseverin): Addressed	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	17th of March 2017 (cseverin): According to PMIS the $200k from Colombia and $265k from Venezuela is available.	
	• The focal area allocation?	17th of March 2017 (cseverin): Yes, the funds are currently available under the IW FA. 28th of March 2017 (cseverin):The FA allocation is subject to the projected shortfall of the GEF Trust Fund. Availability of the FA allocation will have to reviewed at the time of potential future work program inclusion.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		10th of October 2017 (cseverin): Yes the requested funds are available under the IW FA.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	17th of March 2017 (cseverin): No please address the issues identified above. 28th of March 2017 (cseverin): No, please address the above comments. 7th of April 2017 (cseverin):No, Please address above comments. 10th of October 2017 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF is technically cleared and recommended for inclusion into an upcoming Work Program.	
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?		
	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. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	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.