



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	<b>10048</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Regional (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Guatemala)</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Water Funds A Conservation Climate Resilient Model for Stressed Watersheds in Latin America and the Caribbean</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>IADB</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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; IW-1 Program 2;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	<b>\$1,826,484</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$8,114,951</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$9,941,435</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Christian Severin</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>German Sturzenegger</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	18th of June 2018 (cseverin): Yes and the MSP clearly indicate the Aichi targets that the different National investments will deliver towards.	
	2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	18th of June 2018 (cseverin): Yes, the structure is appropriate to deliver indicated results.	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	18th of June 2018 (cseverin): Yes	
	4. Does the project sufficiently	18th of June 2018 (cseverin): Yes	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
<b>Project Design</b>	indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	18th of June 2018 (cseverin):Yes, the project includes clear incremental reasoning.	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	18th of June 2018 (cseverin):Yes	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	18th of June 2018 (cseverin):Yes	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	18th of June 2018 (cseverin):Yes, however, please work towards attracting more cash cofinancing, during the project implementation, to ensure long term sustainability of the water funds.	
	9. 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)	18th of June 2018 (cseverin):Yes	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	18th of June 2018 (cseverin):Yes Cofinancing letters provided.	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools	18th of June 2018 (cseverin):yes, for both	

<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)?

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	completed?	iw and bd	
	12. <i>Only for Non-grant Instrument</i> : Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	18th of June 2018 (cseverin):Yes	
	14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	18th of June 2018 (cseverin):Yes, the project document describes the monitoring plan for the project	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	18th of June 2018 (cseverin):Yes	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	16. 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>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	18th of June 2018 (cseverin):Yes, the funds are available under BD set aside and IW focal areas	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	18th of June 2018 (cseverin):Yes, the funds are available under BD set aside	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
<b>Recommendations</b>	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	18th of June 2018 (cseverin): Yes, the MSP is recommended for Approval	
<b>Review Dates</b>	First Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		