

# **PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)**

for the project:

# Implementing the strategic plan for Ecuador's Mainland Marine and Coastal Protected Areas Network

**FY19** July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019

**Executing Partners** 

MINISTERIO **DEL AMBIENTE** 







|  | Project Information                        |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Project Title:                                     | Implementing the strategic pla<br>Network. | an for Ecuador's Mainland Marine            | and Coastal Protected Areas                            |  |  |  |  |
| Country(ies):                                      | Ecuador                                    | GEF ID:                                     | 9369   |  |  |  |  |
| GEF Agency(ies):                                   | Conservation International                 | Duration In Months:                         | 48   |  |  |  |  |
| Other Executing Partners:                          | Conservation International<br>Ecuador      | Start Date:                                 | 05/2018  |  |  |  |  |
| GEF Focal Area(s):                                 | BD-1 Program 1<br>LD-2 Program 3           | Actual Project Close Date:                  | 05/2022  |  |  |  |  |
| GEF Grant Amount:                                  | 5,963,303                                  | Date of Last Steering<br>Committee Meeting: | February 18th,2019                                     |  |  |  |  |
| Expected Co-financing:                             | 33,739,690                                 | Mid-Term Review-Planned<br>Date:            | June 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2020                            |  |  |  |  |
| Total Project Cost:                                | 39,702,993                                 | Mid-Term Review-Actual<br>Date:             | June 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2020                            |  |  |  |  |
| Co-financing Realized as of June 30, <i>2019</i> : | Pending                                    | Terminal Evaluation-Planned<br>Date:        | March 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2022                           |  |  |  |  |
| Date of First Disbursement:                        | 13/02/2018                                 | Terminal Evaluation-Expected<br>Date:       | March 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2022                           |  |  |  |  |
| Disbursement as of 30 June 2019:                   | -  | PIR Prepared by:                            | Lourdes Guerrero / Manfred<br>Altamirano               |  |  |  |  |
| Actual Expenditures as of 30<br>June <i>2019</i> : | USD 507.577                                | CI-GEF Program Manager:                     | Daniela Carrión<br>Susana Escudero / Shannon<br>Wiecks |  |  |  |  |

The CI-GEF Project Agency Project Implementation Report (PIR) is composed of six sections:

- <u>Section I:</u> Project Implementation Progress Status Summary: provides a brief summary of the project as well as the implementation status and rating of the previous and current fiscal years;
- Section II: Project Results Implementation Progress Status and Rating: describes the progress made towards achieving the project objective and outcomes, the implementation rating of the project, as well as recommendations to improve the project performance, when needed;
- Section III: Project Risks Status and Rating: describes the progress made towards managing and mitigating project risks, the project risks mitigation rating reassessment as needed, as well as recommendations to improve the management of project risks;
- <u>Section IV</u>: Project Environmental and Social Safeguards Implementation Status and Rating: describes the progress made towards complying with the Environmental & Social Safeguards and the Plans prepared during the PPG phase, the safeguard plans implementation rating, as well as recommendations to improve the project safeguards;
- <u>Section V</u>: Project Implementation Experiences and Lessons Learned: describes the experiences learned by the project managers and the lessons learned through the process of implementing the project; and

# **SECTION I: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS SUMMARY**

#### **PROJECT SUMMARY**

This is a foundational project, focused in establishing the enabling conditions and to initiate the implementation of a formal MPA network in Ecuador. The project will contribute to execute priority actions of the MPA network's ten-year strategic plan within the new framework established by the new General Code of the Environment (COA in Spanish) which mandates to develop a new management arrangement for the national system of protected areas (SNAP in Spanish). The project objective is "to substantially improve the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity through an effective coastal and marine protected areas network on mainland Ecuador". It is expected that, at the end of the project, the network will be fully operational. The project is organized into three components.

#### Component 1. Lay the groundwork for efficient MPA network operation.

This component focuses on establishing the foundations for MPA network operation and it has three outcomes: (i) MPA operation, (ii) surveillance, enforcement and prosecution, and (iii) sustainable financing

#### Component 2. On-the-ground active learning.

This component will focus on practical learning generating lessons and experience on integrating MPAs into the coastal ecosystem and therefore to advance MPA network development. The pilots of this component will serve as governance examples for MPA management.

Component 3. Strengthening connectivity of mangroves with inland ecosystems within the MPA network.

This component will focus on laying the foundation for the MPA network's inland connectivity. It is expected that these actions will contribute to mainstreaming the concepts of ecological connectivity into coastal and marine conservation by raising key stakeholders' awareness and developing practical experience and guidelines.

### PRIOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS

### As it is the first year of implementation of the project, this requirement does not apply.

### **CURRENT PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS (FY19)**

In FY19 the project has made important progress in four main areas: institutional and administrative arrangements, control and surveillance, sustainable financing and the establishment of the core working groups for the pilots of components 2 and 3. During FY19, the project organized and supported technically and financially several governmental processes such as updating the SNAP strategic Plan, drafting the proposal for updating the MPA Network strategic Plan and organizing and facilitating the XIII MPA Network Meeting, activities lead by the Ministry of Environment as co-executing agency of this project. The project has also hired several consultancies related to gender mainstreaming, climate change and tourism regulations in protected areas, which constitute important inputs for updating the SNAP strategic plan and provide complementary regulations to the already approved CODA (Organic Code of Environment). The project has also received deliverables from WildAid (project counterpart) in relation to surveillance and control of MPAs, and the PMU has ensured the MoE is involved at every stage in reviewing the deliverables. These deliverables will support the efforts in terms of control and surveillance from the Marine Coastal Protected Areas. Likely, as project co-financing, WildAid has purchased 10 outboard motors for the MPAs, 1 desalinization machine and it has also made some structural arrangements to Isla de la Plata MPA facility. In terms of sustainable financing, there has been significant progress in the implementation of the Ecuador Azul strategy. The agreement between CI and FIAs was signed in March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2019 and the first disbursement of 4 million may take place on July 2019. These resources aim to leverage the operational expenditures of the MPAs. Additionally, both components (2 and 3) have worked on socializing the project, establishing the core working groups and drafting the workplans for implementing the pilot projects. The working groups will be formally established in Q1 FY20, by signing Memorandums of understanding. Regarding the safeguard plans, the project has been socialized with all stakeholders involved. Nonetheless, the PMU continue working in conjunction with the MPA on strategies to involve the shrimp factory into the activities that the pilots will be implementing and more importantly reaching a commitment from its owner to support the conservation efforts. For gendermainstreaming, a consultancy to provide inputs on how to mainstream gender actions into MPA network is being implemented. On the other hand, the grievance mechanism is being socialized with stakeholders since Q3 of FY19, but so far, the project has not received any type of complaints from beneficiaries or stakeholders. The main challenge of Year 1 is that the project has dealt with the change of authorities at central level (ministries, undersecretaries and directors), local (GAD) and regional governments (prefecturas). However, the PMU has been socializing the project, ensuring new authorities are fully engaged and support the implementation. There is constant and fluent communication between SGMC-MoE authorities and PMU team to maintain the support to the project and the activities that are being implemented.

| PROJECT PART                         | PRIOR FY19<br>IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS<br>RATING | CURRENT FY19<br>IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS<br>RATING <sup>1</sup> | RATING TREND <sup>2</sup> |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| OBJECTIVE                            | NA  | S  | NA                        |
| COMPONENTS AND<br>OUTCOMES           | NA  | HS   | NA                        |
| RISKS                                | NA  | HS   | NA                        |
| ENVIRONMENTAL &<br>SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS | NA  | HS   | NA                        |

Implementation Progress (IP) Rating: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more details about IP rating, please see the Appendix I of this report
 Rating trend: Improving, Unchanged, or Decreasing

# **SECTION II: PROJECT RESULTS IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS AND RATING**

This section describes the progress made towards achieving the project objective and outcomes, the implementation progress rating of the project, as well as recommendations to improve the project performance. This section is composed four parts:

- a. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Objective: this section measures the likelihood of achieving the objective of the project
- b. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Outcomes (by project component)
- c. Overall Project Results Progress Rating, and
- d. Recommendations for improvement

### a. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Objective:

This part of the report assesses the progress in achieving the objective of the project.

PROJECT OBJECTIVE: To substantially improve the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity through an effective coastal and marine protected areas network in mainland Ecuador

| OBJECTIVE INDICATORS   | END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS   | PROGRESS<br>RATING <sup>3</sup> | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION   |
|--|--|---------------------------------|--|
| Indicator a: MPA network self-<br>assessment checklist. Unweighted<br>Overall Score.           | 23.33% (May 2017) (It is important that a mistake is<br>shown in the ProDoc 21.7% and is now corrected)<br>31.67% (Jun 2019) | IS                              | A variation of 8.64% between 2017 and 2019 resulted<br>from the MPA assessment. This variation is due to the<br>improvement in capabilities to include better<br>scientific and social/economic information into the                                 |
| Indicator b: MPA network self-<br>assessment checklist. Weighted<br>Ecological Coherence Score | 25.81% (May 2017)<br>29.03% (Jun 2019)   | IS                              | MPA planning. Additionally, the new Environmental<br>Organic Code promotes governance arrangements<br>seeking to consolidate the MPA Network. Finally, the<br>new Ecuador Azul strategy provides sustainable<br>financing opportunities for the MPA. |
| Indicator c: MPA network Biodiversity<br>Tracking Tool METT GEF 6                              | 55.9% (March 2017)   | NS                              | The frequency for this indicator will be carried out<br>on Mid Term and Final term of the project, so by<br>2019 the project will be collecting this information.  |

| OBJECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION<br>PROGRESS RATING | JUSTIFICATION  |
|---|--|
| S   | A Satisfactory rating has been given to the objective implementation. Considering that FY19 has been a year focused on enabling conditions and adaptive management for successful project implementation. The project is advancing well in the proposed objective indicators (>50.0%) and it is on-track for Year 2. |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

### **b.** Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Outcomes (by project component).

### This part of the report assesses the progress towards achieving the outcomes of the project.

| COMPONENT 1 | Establishing the foundations for the efficient operation of the MPA network                              |  |  |
|-------------|--|--|--|
|             |  |  |  |
| Outcome 1:  | Institutional, legal and technical capacity substantially improved to efficiently manage the MPA network |  |  |
| Outcome 2:  | Effectiveness in detecting and sanctioning infractions in MPAs considerably increased                    |  |  |
| Outcome 3:  | Financial mechanism significantly improved for long-term sustainable financing of the MPA network        |  |  |

| OUTCOMES<br>TARGETS/INDICATORS  | END OF PROJECT<br>INDICATOR<br>TARGET   | END OF YEAR<br>INDICATOR STATUS   | PROGRESS RATING <sup>4</sup> | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION   |
|---|---|---|------------------------------|--|
| Outcome 1.1: Institutional,<br>legal and technical capacity<br>substantially improved<br>to efficiently manage the<br>MPA network<br><i>Indicator 1.1: The MPA</i><br><i>network has a formal</i><br><i>normative and</i><br><i>administrative framework</i><br><i>that enables it to function</i><br><i>as part of the SNAP.</i> | The MPA network<br>is embedded into<br>SNAP's operation.<br>There are at least<br>three<br>key elements:<br>1. Institutional<br>and<br>administrative<br>arrangements for<br>network<br>operation have<br>been formally<br>adopted by the<br>national<br>authority.<br>2. The MPA<br>network is<br>embedded<br>into the new<br>management<br>arrangements of<br>the SNAP.<br>3. The MPA<br>network is<br>embedded | <ol> <li>In process</li> <li>3 new<br/>regulations<br/>being<br/>developed<br/>3 current<br/>regulations<br/>being updated<br/>3 regulation<br/>proposals being<br/>developed by<br/>MAE</li> <li>Participation in<br/>6 workshops to<br/>update de SNAP<br/>strategic plan<br/>2 inputs being<br/>developed<br/>2 MPA Network<br/>Meetings were<br/>supported</li> </ol> | IS                           | <ol> <li>The project is preparing proposals in terms of regulations and policies, which will be important inputs to enable the MPA Network to function as part of the SNAP. In this case, MAE has not yet started its process for developing the SNAP Management Model, making it difficult that these arrangements, that the project is developing, can be properly adopted.</li> <li>The Prodoc establishes a set of regulations to enable the function of the MPA Network and as mechanism to fulfill with the COA requirements. The PMU has worked into several consultancy process to obtain 6 regulations as outlined by the Prodoc:         <ul> <li>The regulations for tourism within protected areas is a consultancy that is currently being carried out. The PSC decided to update three related regulations (<i>Adventure travel operation regulations; regulations on observation of whales and dolphins; and Revise, identify and propose reforms to TULAS section 9</i>) and developed two new ones (<i>diving for biodiversity observation purposes; proposal for observing marine megafauna</i>)</li> <li>The technical standards for fishing and aquaculture was a special requirement from SGMC-MoE.</li> <li>RETANP (Reglamento Especial de Turismo en Áreas Naturales Protegidas) and Regulation on tourist guides: These are regulations for tourism in protected natural areas, required by the ProDoc, that are being updated by MoE, and the PSC decided not to work on the updating process of these regulations.</li> </ul> </li></ol> |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4 4</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

| OUTCOMES<br>TARGETS/INDICATORS   | END OF PROJECT<br>INDICATOR<br>TARGET   | END OF YEAR<br>INDICATOR STATUS | PROGRESS RATING <sup>4</sup> | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION  |
|--|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
|  | into the updated<br>SNAP's<br>strategic plan.   |                                 |                              | d. Regarding the COA's secondary regulation on protected areas categories, the National Direction of Biodiversity has already developed a proposal, the PM through the National Project Director has made the formal request of this information.   |
|  |   |                                 |                              | <b>3.</b> In order to mainstream the MPA Network into the updated SNAP strategic Plan, the project has contributed to this process by:  |
|  |   |                                 |                              | a. <b>Updating the MPA Network Strategic Plan</b> for the period 2017-2030.   |
|  |   |                                 |                              | <ul> <li>b. Developing inputs for contributing to the development on the new SNAP strategic Plan such as: <ol> <li>Gender Perspective consultancy is in place and the project has received 2 of 5 products.</li> <li>Climate change consultancy is being carried out and it has also delivered 2 of 3 products.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>  |
|  |   |                                 |                              | c. <b>Supporting the process of the SNAP strategic plan</b> , which is led by the Undersecretary of Natural Heritage, by articulating efforts and providing technical and/or financial support to <b>six workshops</b> which have mainly provided inputs from different stakeholders to update the SNAP strategic plan and has also allowed the project to ensure the MPA Network is mainstreamed within this plan. <i>So far, the current proposal indicates that the objective 3 in the SNAP strategic plan seeks to improve the management capacity of the SNAP and its goal 10 aims to articulate the different administrative organisms from the protected area by strengthening the MPA network management.</i> |
| Indicator 1.2.: There is an<br>training program designed<br>and implemented for<br>enforcement and<br>prosecution officers to<br>facilitate coordinated<br>action in the MPA network | MAE has a long-<br>term training<br>program<br>that offers concise<br>specialized online<br>training courses to<br>improve control<br>and law | 0                               | NS                           | Currently, CEPP, the strategic partner suggested by the ProDoc, is not<br>managing the training platform and it is not operational at this moment. For<br>this reason, the project changed the strategy to directly implement the<br>outputs by the PMU team. Aula Verde online platform is not working right<br>now and therefore the project will change to in-person trainings to<br>implement this outcome.<br>These training courses (management of marine and coastal protected areas   |
|  | enforcement in the MPA network.   |                                 |                              | and application of the law over the environmental crimes committed within   |

| OUTCOMES<br>TARGETS/INDICATORS   | END OF PROJECT<br>INDICATOR<br>TARGET   | END OF YEAR<br>INDICATOR STATUS | PROGRESS RATING <sup>4</sup> | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION  |
|--|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
|  | There are at least:<br>1. At least 10<br>online courses<br>that are offered to<br>enforcement and<br>prosecution<br>officers.<br>2. Permanent staff<br>assigned to<br>administer and<br>manage the<br>program.<br>3. National Budget<br>allocation to<br>finance the<br>program.<br>4. A multi-year<br>workplan with<br>performance<br>indicators for the<br>program. |                                 |                              | the MPA) will have two phases:1. design and 2. implementation. Both willtake place in Y2.<br>The project will implement in-person practical training and retraining to MPA staff in specific areas related to control and surveillance. In this case, the project has invested through WildAid, a strategic partner of this project, in the development of a training plan which is waiting for approval from the SGMC-MOE to be implemented. The implementation of this plan will be carried out by WildAid and it will begin on Q2 of FY20.<br>It is important to consider that the indicator has been reviewed and reformulated to "Courses designed and implemented", since the condition of being on-line can become a difficulty because "Aula verde" is not currently active and the control and surveillance courses characteristics demand greater presence on-site, making also difficult to fulfill with conditions 2,3 and 4. |
| Indicator 1.3.: MPA officers<br>have and apply guidelines<br>for stakeholder<br>engagement and bonding<br>in support of sound<br>protected area governance | There are<br>guidelines for:<br>(i) Engaging and<br>bonding with key<br>stakeholders<br>(mainly fisheries,<br>tourism and<br>coastal activities).<br>(j) Evaluating and<br>strengthen MPA<br>governance.<br>The guidelines<br>must be easily<br>accessible<br>to MPA staff.   | 0                               | NS                           | The guidelines will be available during FY22 for dissemination after<br>implementing the pilots from component 2 and systematize the lessons<br>learned from it.  |

| OUTCOMES<br>TARGETS/INDICATORS  | END OF PROJECT<br>INDICATOR<br>TARGET   | END OF YEAR<br>INDICATOR STATUS   | PROGRESS RATING <sup>4</sup> | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION   |
|---|---|---|------------------------------|--|
|   | Most MPA<br>technical staff<br>(>95%) have<br>been introduced<br>to the guidelines.                                 |   |                              |  |
| Outcome 1.2.:<br>Effectiveness in detecting<br>and sanctioning infractions<br>in MPAs considerably<br>increased | MPA network<br>Year 1 Baseline for<br>prosecution<br>effectiveness<br>Year 2 - PE >30%<br>Year 3 onwards PE<br>>60% | 1 Baseline<br>document that<br>diagnoses the<br>current situation<br>for the MPA<br>network and by<br>MPA | IS                           | <ul> <li>The project is currently developing tools that help on improving law enforcement at MPA jointly with WildAid as strategic partner of the project.</li> <li><b>1. Proposal - register of operations and infractions:</b> a proposal was delivered and already discussed with MAE/SGMC. It is important to mention that this register has been adapted to the new CODA, which is applicable since April 2018.</li> </ul>  |
| Indicator 1.4.: MPA<br>network prosecution<br>effectiveness (PE)  | Individual MPAs<br>Year 1 Baseline for<br>prosecution<br>effectiveness<br>Year 2 PEa >30%                           |   |                              | Additionally, the project has developed a diagnosis on the current situation<br>in terms of surveillance and control and it has also updated five plans of<br>surveillance and control   |
| Indicator 1.5.: individual<br>MPA prosecution<br>effectiveness (PEa)  | Year 3 onwards<br>VAI >60%  |   |                              | <ol> <li>Diagnosis on the current situation of control and surveillance within the<br/>MPA: this gave MAE a general picture about the current situation of MPA<br/>in terms of control and surveillance. This is an important input to<br/>prioritize MPA needs and improve the control and surveillance efforts.</li> </ol>   |
| Indicator 1.6.: Vessel<br>availability index (VAI)  |   |   | IS                           | The project as stated in the ProDoc will invest to provide essential equipment<br>and facilities to the MPA. In this case and before purchasing them, the project<br>has allocated resources on the development of an "investment plan" which<br>indicates where and what should be bought to improve the surveillance and<br>control efforts.   |
|   |   |   |                              | 1. Investment Plan for equipment: this product based on the previous diagnosis have suggested the equipment that need to be bought to strength the control and surveillance efforts in the MPA. This product has been reviewed in conjunction with MAE and it has prioritized the needs of MPA. It is also important to highlight that as counterpart of the project WildAid has endowed 10 outboard motors to 6 MPA. WildAid has also made structural arrangements to |

| OUTCOMES<br>TARGETS/INDICATORS   | END OF PROJECT<br>INDICATOR<br>TARGET | END OF YEAR<br>INDICATOR STATUS  | PROGRESS RATING <sup>4</sup> |   | COMMENTS/JUST                            | TIFICATION  |  |                         |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|---|--|---|--|-------------------------|
|  |                                       |  |                              | and surveillance<br>Additionally, the ProDoc<br>the MPA, in this case so<br>1. <b>Updating the</b><br>REMACOPSE, R<br>partner, has u  | far, the project ha                      | tional Park.<br>development of d<br>as invested resou<br><b>ating plans:</b> (<br>NTA CLARA): Wil<br>of and Surveilla | operating plan<br>irces on:<br>PACOCHE, P<br>dAid, the strat<br>nce Plans wi | ns for<br>PNM,<br>tegic |
| Outcome 1.3.: Financial<br>mechanism significantly<br>improved for long-term<br>sustainable financing of the<br>MPA network<br><i>Indicator 1.7.: Financial gap</i><br><i>of MPA network (USD)</i> | Financial gap<br>reduced in 38%.      | Ecuador Azul<br>account created<br>Agreement FIAS-CI<br>signed and funds<br>transferred (USD 4<br>M) | IS                           | MPA<br>REMACOPSE<br>EL MORRO<br>GALERA<br>MACHALILLA<br>PACOCHE<br>The Project will focus o<br>MPA.<br>for the 4 out of 5 MPAs<br>their operational expen<br>The Agreement betwee | , a significant incr<br>ses is seen.     | ease in the amou  | unt received fo  | or                      |
|  |                                       |  |                              | make the donation we<br>were transferred to th<br>financing of the Walton   | re fulfilled and th<br>e FIAS account to | ne 2 USD millior<br>ogether with 2 l  | from the pro   | oject                   |

| COMPONENT 1<br>IMPLEMENTATION<br>PROGRESS RATING | JUSTIFICATION   | RATING TREND |
|--|---|--------------|
| HS   | Highly Satisfactory rating has been given to this component. During Y1 the project shows good progress in the elements considered by C1 to strengthen the MPA Network governance, despite the government changes. Creating Ecuador Azul subaccount in FIAS trust fund can be highlighted as a major success in Y1. Progress in surveillance and control work as well as institutional arrangements is good. The project has materialized USD 2.5 M of co-financing in this component. |              |

| COMPONENT 2 | On-the-ground active learning   |
|-------------|---|
|             |   |
| Outcome 1:  | Lessons learned from pilots are fully incorporated into new/updated regulations and guidelines for MPA management |

| OUTCOMES<br>TARGETS/INDICATORS  | END OF PROJECT<br>INDICATOR<br>TARGET  | END OF YEAR<br>INDICATOR STATUS   | PROGRESS RATING <sup>5</sup> | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION   |
|---|--|---|------------------------------|--|
| Outcome 2.1.: Lessons<br>learned from pilots are fully<br>incorporated into<br>new/updated regulations<br>and guidelines for MPA<br>Management<br><i>Indicator 2.1.: Number of</i><br><i>guidelines that consider</i><br><i>lessons learned from MPA</i><br><i>conservation in buffer zones</i> | At least two<br>guidelines that<br>complement<br>MPA conservation<br>in coastal buffer<br>zones. | 0<br>However, enabling<br>conditions to<br>achieve the<br>indicator have been<br>met. | IS                           | The baseline in the ProDoc was updated and validated. Then an analysis was carried out by the EA and the implementation strategy changed to direct execution by PMU team given the existing capacities within the technical team of the project. The PMU reformulated the workplan and this was socialized with the main stakeholders. The core working group for pilots REMACOPSE and ANRPV has been established, as indicated by the ProDoc. The workplan will be implemented in each pilot in Y2.<br>Workplans are currently being validated and they include the necessary activities to develop the guidelines and lessons learned about the conservation and the co-management of these sites. |

| COMPONENT 2<br>IMPLEMENTATION<br>PROGRESS RATING | JUSTIFICATION  | RATING TREND |
|--|--|--------------|
| HS   | A Highly Satisfactory rating has been given to component 2. During Y1, enabling conditions have been set to start the implementation of activities in the two pilots. It can be highlighted the establishment of the core working group that has worked in a participatory workplan for governance improvement of the two sites. | NA           |

| COMPONENT 3 | On-the-ground active learning   |
|-------------|---|
|             |   |
| Outcome 1:  | Lessons learned from pilots are fully incorporated into new/updated regulations and guidelines for MPA management |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5 5</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

| OUTCOMES<br>TARGETS/INDICATORS  | END OF PROJECT<br>INDICATOR<br>TARGET  | END OF YEAR<br>INDICATOR STATUS   | PROGRESS RATING <sup>6</sup> | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION  |
|---|--|---|------------------------------|---|
| Outcome 3.1.: Connectivity<br>between coastal<br>mangroves and adjacent<br>inland habitats within the<br>MPA network improved<br>Indicator 3.1.: Land area<br>under sustainable<br>management and/or<br>restoration practices | 1,121.8 ha under<br>sustainable<br>management and<br>/ restoration<br>practices<br>that conserve or<br>restore<br>connectivity<br>between<br>mangroves and<br>inland<br>vegetation<br>REMACAM pilot<br>840 ha -<br>Equatorial Choco<br>evergreen<br>lowland forest<br>177 ha -<br>Equatorial Choco<br>mangrove<br>El Conchal pilot<br>7.4 ha - Jama-<br>Zapotillo low<br>forest and<br>deciduous shrubs<br>97.4 ha – Jama .<br>Zapotillo | 0<br>However, enabling<br>conditions to<br>achieve the<br>indicator have been<br>met. | IS                           | The baseline of the ProDoc was updated and validated. The project was<br>socialized and the members of the core working groups for the pilots<br>Manglares de Hualtaco / Isla Seca and La Loma have been identified and the<br>group has been established. The project jointly with the MPA (REMACAM and<br>REAR) and the main stakeholders have constructed the workplans FY20 for<br>each pilot.<br>Based on data validated, MoE has indicated that probably the 177 ha -<br>Equatorial Choco mangrove concession will increase to 320 ha, by expanding<br>the area under concession. So, the new area under sustainable management<br>will be 1264,8 ha. |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> <sup>6</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

| COMPONENT 3<br>IMPLEMENTATION<br>PROGRESS RATING | JUSTIFICATION  | RATING TREND |
|--|--|--------------|
| S  | A Satisfactory rating has been given to component 3. The project is making progress in establishing the enabling conditions to start the restoration activities in Y2. A core working group has been established for each pilot. | NA           |

# c. Overall Project Results Rating

### **OVERALL PROJECT RESULTS IMPLENTATION RATING**

| OVEF | RALL RATING | JUSTIFICATION   | RATING TREND <sup>7</sup> |
|------|-------------|---|---------------------------|
|      | HS          | Highly Satisfactory rating has been given to project results implementation. Overall, the project is progressing well in all planned activities and expected results are on track. During Y1 the project has focus on enabling conditions needed to set the ground for successful implementation of the pilots in component 2 and 3 as well as the governance arrangements for the MPA network. | NA                        |

## d. Recommendations`

| CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)   | RESPONSIBLE PARTY | DEADLINE  |
|--|-------------------|-----------|
| Manage local stakeholders' expectations when implementing the workplans for each pilot site of component 2 and 3 | PMU team          | June 2020 |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Rating trend: Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

# **SECTION III: PROJECT RISKS STATUS AND RATING**

### a. Progress towards Implementing the Project Risk Mitigation Plan

This section describes the activities implemented to manage and reduce high, substantial, modest, and low risks of the project. This section has three parts:

- a. Ratings for the progress towards implementing measures to mitigate project risks and a project risks annual reassessment
- b. Recommendations for improving project risks management

### a. Progress towards Implementing the Project Risk Mitigation and Plan Project Risks Annual Reassessment

| PROJECT RISKS   | PRODOC RISK<br>MITIGATION<br>MEASURE   | MITIGATION<br>MEASURES<br>IMPLEMENTATION   | PROGRESS<br>RATING <sup>8</sup> | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION   | PRODOC<br>RISK<br>RATING | CURRENT<br>FY19 RISK<br>RATING | RISK<br>RATING<br>TREND <sup>9</sup> |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Risk 1:</b> Internal<br>opposition, within<br>MAE, to consolidate<br>the MPA network | Maintain smooth<br>communication and<br>information flow to<br>the Minister, Vice<br>Minister,<br>Undersecretary of<br>Natural Patrimony,<br>General Legal<br>Coordination Office,<br>and General<br>Administrative and<br>Financial<br>Coordination Office<br>through round table<br>meetings. Implement<br>a communication<br>strategy through key<br>messages about the<br>importance and<br>effectiveness<br>of the MPA network.<br>Provide information<br>and facts to address<br>concerns. | The MPA Network<br>meeting and the<br>steering committees<br>have been spaces to<br>share information<br>with high-level<br>authorities.<br>A communication<br>strategy has been<br>designed for the<br>project including its<br>pilots.<br>MAE Information<br>requests have been<br>answered on time. | IS                              | Within the framework of outcome 1.1,<br>the new Environmental Organic Code<br>and the Ministerial Agreement for the<br>creation of the MPA Network has<br>provided legal support to consolidate<br>the MPA Network<br>Additionally, project activities as well as<br>its advances and budget execution has<br>properly been informed through:<br>MPA Network Meetings: 2<br>Steering Committee Meetings: 4<br>Reports requested by SGMC – MAE: 12<br>Additionally, a video has been prepared<br>for the project and key messages have<br>been shared via social networks | S                        | Μ                              | Decreasing                           |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Rating trend: Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

| PROJECT RISKS  | PRODOC RISK<br>MITIGATION<br>MEASURE  | MITIGATION<br>MEASURES<br>IMPLEMENTATION   | PROGRESS<br>RATING <sup>8</sup> | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION   | PRODOC<br>RISK<br>RATING | CURRENT<br>FY19 RISK<br>RATING | RISK<br>RATING<br>TREND <sup>9</sup> |
|--|---|--|---------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Risk 2:</b> Limited<br>political support to<br>develop and<br>implement<br>SNAP's new<br>management<br>arrangements                                       | Maintain smooth<br>communication with<br>the Minister and Vice<br>Minister.<br>Prepare information<br>briefs to present to<br>the Office of the<br>President and other<br>entities. | As the risk is not<br>activated, a<br>mitigation action has<br>not been applied. | NS                              | Within the framework of outcome 1.1,<br>products from consultancies are being<br>developed and are being reviewed in<br>conjunction with SGMC. Then the next<br>step will be working with SGMC to<br>achieve their adoption as new<br>management arrangements.<br>Nevertheless, it is important to<br>highlight that new management model<br>the government is currently promoting<br>may demand greater efforts to<br>implement new management<br>arrangements. | S                        | S                              | Unchanged                            |
| <b>Risk 3:</b> Vandalism of<br>surveillance and<br>communication<br>equipment  | Implement<br>protective<br>measures and secure<br>prompt<br>restoration of<br>surveillance and<br>communication<br>facilities   | As the risk is not<br>activated, a<br>mitigation action has<br>not been applied. | NS                              | Within the framework of outcome 1.2,<br>the project has not worked in this<br>measure, but Ecuadorian law requires<br>that any good from the Central State<br>needs to be insured. Additionally, the<br>project will ensure that the Donation<br>documents have a clause that<br>indicates the equipment endowed<br>need to be protected.  | S                        | S                              | Unchanged                            |
| <b>Risk 4:</b> Reluctance of<br>enforcement<br>authorities to<br>collaborate and<br>coordinate<br>surveillance of<br>MPAs and<br>prosecution of<br>offenders | Maintain smooth<br>communication with<br>central<br>and local authorities.<br>Provide information<br>and facts to address<br>concerns.  | As the risk is not<br>activated, a<br>mitigation action has<br>not been applied. | NS                              | <ul> <li>Within the framework of outcome 1.2, none MPA so far has requested the Project any type of intervention for these cases.</li> <li>It is important to remark that through our strategic partner we expect to develop interinstitutional agreements that contribute to the mitigation of this type of risk.</li> </ul>  | М                        | М                              | Unchanged                            |
| <b>Risk 5:</b> Internal<br>opposition, within<br>MAE, to establish<br>individual<br>budgets to MPAs  | See above in Risk 1.  | As the risk is not<br>activated, a<br>mitigation action has<br>not been applied. | NS                              | Within the framework of outcome 1.3,<br>"Ecuador Azul" seeks to distribute the<br>revenues for the 5 MPA that will be<br>benefited. The allocation of these<br>resources will be monitor from FY21.  | S                        | S                              | Unchanged                            |

| PROJECT RISKS  | PRODOC RISK<br>MITIGATION<br>MEASURE  | MITIGATION<br>MEASURES<br>IMPLEMENTATION  | PROGRESS<br>RATING <sup>8</sup> | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION   | PRODOC<br>RISK<br>RATING | CURRENT<br>FY19 RISK<br>RATING | RISK<br>RATING<br>TREND <sup>9</sup> |
|--|---|---|---------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Risk 6:</b> Low<br>importance in the<br>presidential agenda<br>to sign<br>the Presidential<br>Decree                      | Monthly meetings<br>with the Minister of<br>MAE to inform<br>him or her about<br>advances related to<br>the MPA network<br>project. | Risk was eliminated<br>when a Ministerial<br>Agreement was<br>signed for the<br>creation of the MPA<br>Network.                   | CA                              | Within the framework of outcome 1.3,<br>risk is not anymore active and has<br>been eliminated with the Ministerial<br>Agreement.   | S                        | L                              | Decreasing                           |
| <b>Risk 7:</b> Change of<br>local governments<br>in Ecuador. New<br>authorities<br>will take office in<br>2019 <sub>72</sub> | Encourage local<br>stakeholders<br>to present the<br>project to new<br>municipal<br>authorities.                                    | Organize the<br>necessary meetings<br>to socialize the<br>project with new<br>authorities in<br>conjunction with<br>stakeholders. | IS                              | Within the framework of Outcome 2.1,<br>the project carried out different<br>meetings have been held at different<br>times with new authorities.   | S                        | М                              | Decreasing                           |
| <b>Risk 8:</b> Reluctance of<br>municipalities<br>and user groups to<br>accept<br>MPA buffer zones                           | Reluctance of<br>municipalities<br>and user groups to<br>accept MPA buffer<br>zones   | As the risk is not<br>activated, a<br>mitigation action has<br>not been applied.  | NS                              | <ul> <li>Within the framework of Outcome 2.1, the project has ensured the inclusion of every actor while socializing the project.</li> <li>Establishing the core working group is focused on reducing this type of risk and so obtain support during the implementation process.</li> </ul>  | S                        | S                              | Unchanged                            |
| <b>Risk 9:</b> Impact of<br>illegal activities on<br>managing mangrove<br>and<br>forest areas in<br>REMACAM                  | Encourage increased<br>presence of Coast<br>Guard and<br>police in the area.  | As the risk is not<br>activated, a<br>mitigation action has<br>not been applied.  | NS                              | <ul> <li>Within the framework of Outcome 3.1, the project will facilitate the concession to the commune and so increase the number of people surveilling the area.</li> <li>The Project has not initiated any process to stop the mangrove deforestation. Activities to promote this will be included in the workplan.</li> <li>Maybe through the development of the interinstitutional agreements some</li> </ul> | S                        | S                              | Unchanged                            |

| PROJECT RISKS   | PRODOC RISK<br>MITIGATION<br>MEASURE  | MITIGATION<br>MEASURES<br>IMPLEMENTATION  | PROGRESS<br>RATING <sup>8</sup> | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION  | PRODOC<br>RISK<br>RATING | CURRENT<br>FY19 RISK<br>RATING | RISK<br>RATING<br>TREND <sup>9</sup> |
|---|---|---|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|   |   |   |                                 | sort of collaboration could be achieved.  |                          |                                |                                      |
| <b>Risk 10:</b> Effects of El<br>Niño / La Niña on<br>agroforestry<br>production in<br>REMACAM pilot site   | Monitor information<br>and<br>alerts in national<br>meteorological<br>entities, NOAA, and<br>World<br>Meteorological<br>Organization  | Risk has not<br>activated; El Niño<br>and La Niña have<br>not showed up<br>during the last<br>years.  | NS                              | <ul> <li>Within the framework of Outcome 3.1, this information will start being monitor with the implementation of the pilot.</li> <li>Activity will start on Y2 according POA FY20 and it is included as part of the workplan.</li> </ul>  | Μ                        | М                              | Unchanged                            |
| <b>Risk 11:</b> Execution<br>problems caused<br>by complex<br>administrative<br>system and frequent<br>changes<br>of authorities and<br>public<br>policies (see page<br>56) | Maintain smooth<br>communication and<br>information to the<br>Minister, Vice<br>Minister,<br>Undersecretary<br>of Natural Heritage,<br>General<br>Legal Coordination<br>Office, and General<br>Administrative and<br>Financial<br>Coordination Office.<br>Implement a change<br>communications<br>strategy. Provide<br>information and facts<br>to address concerns.<br>Ensure that the<br>project team is stable<br>and protected from<br>political decisions. | Maintain the<br>authorities informed<br>about the project<br>advances.<br>Maintain meetings<br>with new MAE<br>authorities.<br>Socialize with new<br>authorities of the<br>undersecretary of<br>coastal and marine<br>management. | IS                              | Within the framework of the project,<br>authorities are periodically informed<br>through the management and steering<br>committees. They are aware that<br>delays may be justified due to recent<br>changes in local and central<br>authorities.<br>Meetings with new authorities have<br>been held to introduce the team and<br>explain the hiring process as a<br>mechanism to ensure the stability of<br>the team. | S                        | S                              | Unchanged                            |
| Risk 12: Climate<br>change  | Mainstream climate<br>change<br>considerations into<br>SNAP's strategic<br>plan.  | A study is taking<br>place to obtain<br>inputs that will be<br>put into   | IS                              | Within the framework of the project,<br>products from this consultancy are<br>being reviewed in conjunction with<br>MAE. The project has ensured that the<br>products delivered until now have  | S                        | S                              | Unchanged                            |

| PROJECT RISKS | PRODOC RISK<br>MITIGATION<br>MEASURE | MITIGATION<br>MEASURES<br>IMPLEMENTATION   | PROGRESS<br>RATING <sup>8</sup> | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION  | PRODOC<br>RISK<br>RATING | CURRENT<br>FY19 RISK<br>RATING | RISK<br>RATING<br>TREND <sup>9</sup> |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|               |                                      | consideration for the SNAP strategic Plan. |                                 | been discussed with SGMC and they will be put into consideration for the implementation of the plans. |                          |                                |                                      |

| PROJECT RISKS<br>MITIGATION<br>MEASURES<br>RATING | JUSTIFICATION  | RISK RATING<br>TREND <sup>10</sup> |
|---|--|------------------------------------|
| HS  | A Highly Satisfactory rating has been given to the risks mitigation measures. The risks have been monitored by the project and measures updated as needed. | NA                                 |

## Recommendations

| MITIGATION AND CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)   | <b>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</b> | DEADLINE   |
|---|--------------------------|------------|
| Continue monitoring risks mitigation measures closely and update as needed, specially when implementing the pilots for Component 2 and 3. | PMU team                 | June, 2020 |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Rating trend: Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

# SECTION IV: PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS IMPLEMENTATION STATUS AND RATING

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved Environmental and Social Safeguard plans, as well as recommendations to improve the implementation of the safeguard plans, when needed. This section is divided in three parts:

- a. Progress towards Complying with the CI-GEF Project Agency's Environmental & Social Safeguards
- b. Overall Project Safeguard Implementation Rating
- c. Recommendations

## a. Progress towards Complying with the CI-GEF Project Agency's Environmental & Social Safeguards

| MI                         | NIMUM SAFEGUARD INDICATORS   | PROJECT<br>TARGET | END OF YEAR STATUS         | PROGRESS<br>RATING <sup>11</sup> | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION   |
|----------------------------|--|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| ACCOU<br>MECHA<br>1.<br>2. | NTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE<br>NISM<br>Number of conflict and complaint<br>cases reported to the project's<br>Accountability and Grievance<br>Mechanism<br>Percentage of conflict and<br>complaint cases reported to the<br>project's Accountability and<br>Grievance Mechanism that have<br>been resolved | 0                 | 0<br>0                     | IS                               | The accountability and grievance mechanism are socialized at every presentation made by the project. So far, we have not received any verbal complaint nor verbal neither written.   |
| GENDE                      | R MAINSTREAMING<br>Number of men and women that<br>participated in project activities (e.g.<br>meetings, workshops, consultations)   | N/A               | Men<br>342<br>Women<br>233 |                                  | 33 meetings and workshops have been organized by the project, most<br>of these meetings have been done to socialize the project with the<br>main stakeholders, including the 4 pilot areas.  |
| 2.                         | Number of men and women that<br>received benefits (e.g. employment,<br>income generating activities,<br>training, access to natural resources,<br>land tenure or resource rights,<br>equipment, leadership roles) from<br>the project.   | N/A               | <b>Men</b><br>25           | IS                               | So far, the activities of the project have not been implemented, they<br>are being currently designed and so there are not benefits coming<br>from them at this moment. Nevertheless, within the framework of the<br>project, WildAid, has trained 25 MPA staff in specific areas such as OMI<br>and surveillance and control operations topics. |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

| 3.     | Number of strategies, plans (e.g.<br>management plans and land use<br>plans) and policies derived from the<br>project that include gender<br>considerations (this indicator applies<br>to relevant projects)                 | N/A | 1   |    | The project has updated the MPA Network Strategic Plan which has incorporated considerations in terms of gender.   |
|--------|--|-----|---|----|--|
| STAKEF | IOLDER ENGAGEMENT  |     |   |    |  |
| 1.     | Number of government agencies,<br>civil society organizations, private<br>sector, indigenous peoples and<br>other stakeholder groups that have<br>been involved in the project<br>implementation phase on an annual<br>basis | 9   | 25  | IS | C1<br>WWF, WILDAID, CI, ECOLAP, SEDEFA, Alvaro Dahik, Alexandra<br>Vasquez, CIIFEN<br>C2<br>GAD Salinas, Capitanía Salinas, Gobernación Sta. Elena, MINTUR, MAE,<br>GAD Playas.<br>C3<br>GAD Huaquillas, 5 Asoc. De pescadores, INPC, GAD El Oro, MINTUR,<br>Camaronera Aguamarina, UTMACH, MAE, 1 Comuna: Lucha y Progreso. |
| 2.     | Number persons (sex<br>disaggregated) that have been<br>involved in project implementation<br>phase (on an annual basis)   | 120 | 575<br><b>Men</b><br>342<br><b>Women</b><br>233 | IS | 575 stakeholders have participated in socialization events,<br>workshops, and meetings. It is important to remark that indirect<br>beneficiaries have also been included in the socialization events.  |
| 3.     | Number of engagement (e.g.<br>meeting, workshops, consultations)<br>with stakeholders during the project<br>implementation phase (on an<br>annual basis)   | 8   | 33  | IS | Since the project start being implemented, 33 engagement events<br>have taken place. For this section we consider workshops, meetings,<br>socialization events. In all these events we have socialize the project<br>or we have presented the progress achieved.   |
| 4.     | Percentage of stakeholders who<br>rate as satisfactory the level at<br>which their views and concerns are<br>taken into account by the project   | 80% | ТВА   | NS | To be measured by CI-GEF agency.   |
|        | AL CULTURAL RESOURCES  |     |   |    |  |
| 1.     | Number of physical cultural<br>resources found in the project area<br>that have been negatively impacted<br>as a result of the project   | 0   | 0   | IS | The project is working with local stakeholders to<br>promote a sustainable and responsible tourism in the area,<br>highlighting the value of Isla Seca in terms of its ecological and<br>archeological value.  |

# b. Overall Project Safeguard Implementation Rating

### SUMMARY: PROJECT SAFEGUARD IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY TYPE OF PLAN

| SAFEGUARDSTRIGGERED BY THE PROJECT (delete those not applicable) | CURRENT FY19<br>IMPLEMENTATION RATING | RATING TREND |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Accountability and Grievance Mechanisms                          | HS                                    | NA           |
| Gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP)                                  | HS                                    | NA           |
| Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)                                | HS                                    | NA           |
| Physical Cultural Resources                                      | HS                                    | NA           |

### OVERALL PROJECT SAFEGUARD IMPLEMENTATION RATING

| RATING | JUSTIFICATION  | RATING TREND |
|--------|--|--------------|
| HS     | The project socialized the grievance mechanism with stakeholders and there were no grievances at the end of the first year of implementation. The project engaged a wide variety of stakeholders and held 33 engagements in the first year. Women participation is at 40% which is commendable. The project is worked with local stakeholders to ensure that no cultural site was negatively impacted. | NA           |

### c. Recommendations

| CORRECTIVE ACTION(S)   | RESPONSIBLE PARTY | DEADLINE      |
|--|-------------------|---------------|
| While women participation was high, the number of women beneficiaries was zero. The project should take steps to ensure that women also receive benefits from the project. | PMU               | June 30, 2020 |

# **SECTION V: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS LEARNED**

#### **Required topics**

#### 1. Project institutional arrangements, including project governance

At the beginning of the project, it was found that all the members that were participating in the Committees meetings were not part of the project structure and at some point, their participation was causing conflicts with the official members. To manage this, the project decided to develop an Internal Regulation for the Organization and the Operation of the committees, which was approved by the PSC and became part of the governance arrangements of the project. This action allowed to exercise greater control over the decision-making process. Another important lesson learnt in the execution of this project to date, especially for pilots, is that by establishing the core working groups, the project seeks to reduce the level of conflicts and ensure the support and coordination from main stakeholders for the pilot's implementation.

As a recommendation it is also important to review the strategies established by the ProDoc and determine its feasibility in PPG phase. For the specific case of the project, several strategies have been reformulated from having a strategic partner to direct implementation, strengthening the co-executing agencies capacities.

Another advantage in terms of project governance has been maintaining a close relationship with the GEF implementing agency, where any doubts or concerns about reports, agency procedures or activities implementation have been easily solved with the Agency LAC focal point.

### 2. Capacity building

CI has several protocols, systems and tools that the specialists should manage satisfactorily from the beginning of the project execution. Training should be provided during the first weeks of implementation to allow technicians be aware of the different tools they have available to perform their job. Capacity building in finance and operations is needed to better understand the CI GEF policies.

#### 3. Implementation of safeguard policies, including gender mainstreaming, accountability and grievance mechanisms, stakeholder consultations

Regarding the implementation of the safeguards, it is important to point out that from its design the safeguards were not budgeted and in the case of gender for example as the team does not have the expertise in gender issues, it has been necessary to look for experts that help the project to develop some of the activities outlined in the ProDoc. Nevertheless, there are other type of safeguards that have been included in the workplan of every pilot so they can be developed during the lifecycle of the project, ensuring its compliance in accord with the ProDoc. Support on safeguards policies and implementation is needed for the PMU team to ensure mainstreaming safeguards in project components.

#### 4. Factors that improve likelihood of long-term sustainability of project impacts

The main factor to improve the likelihood of long-term sustainability of the project is through the creation of the subaccount Ecuador Azul, whose revenues will support the maintenance of the surveillance and communications equipment that will be endowed to the protected areas. To define sustainability strategies from the beginning of the project is key to ensure the project results will be institutionalized and guarantee long term impacts of the interventions.

### 5. Factors that encourage replication, including outreach, dissemination of lessons learned, and communications strategies

The strategic location of the project office allows a close interaction with the National Director of the project, which in this case represents the main counterpart, MoE. Similarly, for this first year the project has developed audio-visual material that has been disseminated and publicized through the social networks and mailing lists, as a mechanism to share information about results and early lessons learnt from Y1. To develop a communication strategy early in implementation phase is key to systematize the results from the beginning and share the project information with diverse audiences, positioning the project with local stakeholders from the beginning.

### 6. Interpretation and application of GEF guidelines

The Implementing Agency has assisted the PMU in understanding the GEF guideline through emails, feedback on quarterly reports and during meetings with GEF representatives. At the operational level the application of GEF guidelines have been key during the hiring and contracting processes that the project has carried out to date. In this sense, the Project has developed an operations Manual that will clarify the correct use of resources from the budget. Close support from the IA is useful to comply with GEF requirements accordingly.

### 7. Financing and co-management

In terms of financial management, the financial processes for contracting and executing the payments take too much time, and frequently the activities established in the ProDoc do not consider these times when setting up the activities schedule; this situation for example has provoked budget underspent for this FY19. It is recommended that technicians and especially administrative personnel will require high levels of training due to the complexity of some processes and the paperwork required. For example, transferring the funds for the Ecuador Azul subaccount have taken approximately three months, due to the complexity and extended processes that need to be followed in Ecuador and HQ offices.

In terms of co-financing, the project is currently facing some difficulties obtaining the information required. Starting the co-financing monitoring earlier in the year is needed to ensure all letters are submitted on time, knowing the materialized co-financing from each source of funding that supports the project.

# **APPENDIX I: PROJECT ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING**

| Rating                         |       | Overdue (O) | Delayed (D) | Not started on schedule<br>(NS) | Under implementation<br>on schedule (IS) | Completed/Achieved<br>(CA) |  |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|
| Highly Satisfactory (HS)       | HS 0% |             |             | 100%                            |  |                            |  |
| Satisfactory (S)               | S     | 20          | %           | 80%                             |  |                            |  |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS)   | MS    | 40          | %           | 60%                             |  |                            |  |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | MU    | 60          | %           | 40%                             |  |                            |  |
| Unsatisfactory (U)             | U     | 80          | %           | 20%                             |  |                            |  |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)     | HU    | 100         | 0%          | 0%                              |  |                            |  |

• Highly Satisfactory: 100% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project. The project can be presented as an example of "good practice" project,

- Satisfactory: 80% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; except for only 20% that are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action,
- **Moderately Satisfactory**: 60% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; while 40% are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action,
- Moderately Unsatisfactory: 40% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; while 60% are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action,
- Unsatisfactory: only 20% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; while 80% are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action, and
- **Highly Unsatisfactory**: 100% of the indicators: a) are overdue, and/or b) delayed in their implementation, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project.

# **APPENDIX II: PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT EXPECTED OUTPUTS**

| INDICATORS   | PROJECT TARGET   | END OF YEAR INDICATOR<br>STATUS  | PROGRESS RATING <sup>12</sup> | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION  |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|---|
| Outcome 1.1: Institutional, legal and  | d technical capacity substantially im  | proved to efficiently manage the I   | MPA network                   |   |
| Output Indicator 1.1.1:<br>Indicator 1.1.1.a: During year 1, the<br>Institutional, legal and<br>administrative arrangement for<br>MPA network operation has been<br>formally adopted by the national<br>authority. | Existence of legal instruments<br>(e.g., administrative<br>resolutions) that establish<br>institutional and administrative<br>arrangements for MPA network | <ul> <li>COA entered into force in<br/>April 2018.</li> <li>Proposal for<br/>recategorizing existing<br/>protected areas.</li> <li>Technical standards for<br/>fishing and aquaculture in<br/>progress.</li> </ul> | IS                            | <ul> <li>Adoption process for the arrangements developed by the project will start after receiving the products from the consultancies.</li> <li>MAE has proposed a regulation for recategorizing the protected areas and the project has requested this document to DNB.</li> <li>The project will prepare in FY20 a regulation on special conservation areas as established by the ProDoc</li> </ul>  |
| Indicator 1.1.1.b: Until year 3, the<br>MPA network has been embedded<br>into the new management<br>arrangement for the SNAP.  | Updated SNAP plan<br>New management categories<br>of MPAs  | <ul> <li>6 SNAP strategic Plan<br/>workshops.</li> <li>Two inputs in terms of<br/>climate change and<br/>gender are being<br/>developed.</li> <li>MPA Network Strategic<br/>plan updated.</li> </ul>               | IS                            | <ul> <li>Inputs will complement SNAP and<br/>MPA network strategic plans<br/>implementation.</li> <li>The project has linked and<br/>influenced the SNAP strategic plan<br/>by promoting the participation of<br/>the Undersecretary of Marine and<br/>Coastal Management and the<br/>protected areas in the process for<br/>updating the SNAP Strategic Plan.<br/>These types of actions have<br/>allowed to visualize the MPA<br/>Network in the strategies and<br/>actions established in the SNAP<br/>strategic Plan.</li> <li>Other process developed by the<br/>project is the MPA Network<br/>Strategic Plan, which has been<br/>officially delivered to the<br/>Undersecretary of Marine and<br/>Coastal Management for its<br/>adoption</li> </ul> |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

| <b>Output Indicator 1.1.2:</b><br>Indicator 1.1.2.a.: Number of MPA<br>rangers per year (segregated by<br>gender) that have completed the<br>training courses. | 100 | 25 | IS | Within the framework of the project<br>and in accordance to the practical<br>training strategy, WildAid has trained<br>25 MPA staff in subjects related to<br>IMO (International Maritime<br>Organization) certification courses<br>and control and surveillance<br>operations.  |
|--|-----|----|----|--|
| Indicator 1.1.2.b.: Number of<br>enforcement and prosecution<br>officers per year (segregated by<br>organization and gender)                                   |     | 0  | IS | The project has also prepared the ToR<br>to hire a consultancy that design<br>courses for MPA management and<br>law application for environmental<br>crimes. It is important to remark that<br>the approval process has required<br>several meetings with SGMC <sup>13</sup> to<br>adjust these ToR.<br>Then, on a second phase the project<br>will hire the implementation of these<br>courses. |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> SGMC – Subsecretaría de Gestión Marino y Costera (Undersecretary of Marine and Coastal Management)

| Output Indicator 1.1.3:   | End of project target <b>4 updated</b><br>or new regulations |   |    | From regulations established in the ProDoC:   |
|---|--|---|----|---|
| Indicator 1.1.3.a.: Number of<br>updated or new regulations for<br>tourism in MPAs. |  |   |    | <ol> <li>According to the National<br/>Biodiversity Directorate, the<br/>RETANP (Reglamento Especial de<br/>Turismo en Áreas Naturales<br/>Protegidas) and tourist guides<br/>regulations are being updated, and<br/>the process has a significant<br/>advance. This is the reason why the<br/>steering committee suggested not<br/>to initiate a new updating process<br/>for these specific regulations.</li> </ol> |
|   |  | 0 |    | 2. During the Steering Committee<br>Meeting on February 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2019, its<br>member decided to work on<br>specific regulations. In this case a<br>consultancy was hired to update or<br>develop the following regulations:   |
|   |  |   | IS | <ul> <li>Adventure travel operations<br/>regulations (update)</li> <li>Regulations on observation of<br/>whales and dolphins (update)</li> <li>Regulations for diving<br/>(Developing a proposal)</li> <li>Regulations for observation of<br/>marine megafauna (Developing<br/>a proposal)</li> </ul>   |
|   |  |   |    | Additionally, to the regulations<br>established within the ProDoc, the<br>steering Committee decided to update<br>the following regulation:<br>- Revise, identify and propose<br>reforms to TULAS section 9 in<br>what refers to public use,<br>tourism and recreation fees in<br>SNAP protected areas.   |

| Output Indicator 1.1.4:<br>Indicator 1.1.4.a: Number of<br>guidelines to efficiently incorporate<br>MPAs into coastal zone<br>management and number of MPA<br>officers (disaggregated by MPA<br>and gender) introduced to the<br>guidelines. | End of project target - <b>3</b><br><b>guidelines</b> to efficiently<br>incorporate MPAs into coastal<br>zone management designed and<br>disseminated and <b>at least 10</b><br><b>MPA officers trained</b> in the<br>guidelines use. | N/A                       | NS | Guidelines will be generated after<br>implementing pilots from component 2.   |
|--|---|---------------------------|----|---|
| Output Indicator 1.1.5:<br>Indicator 1.1.5.a: Number of<br>guidelines for moving from conflict<br>to collaboration and number of<br>MPA officers (disaggregated by<br>MPA and gender) trained in the<br>guidelines use.                      | End of project target - <b>3</b><br><b>guidelines</b> for moving from<br>conflict to collaboration with<br>key stakeholders in MPAs<br>designed and disseminated<br>through training courses  | N/A                       | NS | Guidelines will be generated after<br>implementing pilots from component 2.   |
| Outcome 1.2 Effectiveness in detecti   | ng and sanctioning infractions in MP  | As considerably increased |    |   |
| Output Indicator 1.2.1:<br>Indicator 1.2.1.a: During year 2 a<br>regulatory framework and<br>procedures for detecting and<br>sanctioning infractions has been<br>adopted by the MoE.   | A regulatory framework and<br>procedures for detecting and<br>sanctioning infractions<br>implemented  | N/A                       | NS | WildAid, as our strategic partner, will<br>be working on this indicator during<br>FY20 by assessing existing<br>interinstitutional agreements and<br>developing new ones as required. |
| Indicator 1.2.1.b: Number of inter-<br>institutional agreements for<br>analysis and apply of the<br>regulatory framework and<br>procedures have been signed.   | End of project target – <b>5</b><br>agreements  | N/A                       | NS |   |

| Output Indicator 1.2.2:<br>Indicator 1.2.2.a.: Vessel<br>availability index (VAI) for each<br>boat and vehicle purchased by the<br>project.<br>Indicator 1.2.2.b.: Repeater Tower<br>Uptime (installed and operative)<br>Indicator 1.2.2.c.: Radio availability<br>index. | End of project target<br>VAI >60%<br>End of project target<br>Target RTU>99%<br>End of project target<br>Target RAI>95% | 1 investment plan delivered<br>1 register of operations and<br>infractions. | IS<br>NS<br>NS | WildAid within the framework of the<br>project, has endowed 10 outboard<br>engines for the protected areas of<br>Pacoche (2), Machalilla (2), El Pelado<br>(1), Remacopse (2), El Morro (2),<br>Santa Clara (1), and it has also made<br>structural arrangements to Isla de la<br>Plata facility.<br>The project has also delivered an<br>investment plan for the MPA and it has<br>also developed a register of operations<br>and infractions which serves as a<br>tracking tool for environmental<br>infractions. The two products have<br>been reviewed in conjunction with<br>SGMC and will contribute to an<br>efficient law enforcement.<br>In a second phase, the project will work<br>with SGMC to promote the adoption of<br>this tool within the MPA. It will also<br>include training for the lawyers to fill<br>out this matrix. |  |
|---|---|---|----------------|--|--|
| Output Indicator 1.2.3:<br>Indicator 1.2.3.a: Number of MPAs<br>with specific monitoring, control<br>and surveillance plans.<br>Indicator 1.2.3.b: Number of<br>infractions leading to prosecution<br>and penalties   | End of project target<br><b>5 Specific monitoring, control</b><br><b>and surveillance plans</b><br>N/A                  | 5 Specific monitoring,<br>control and surveillance<br>plans updated         | CA             | So far, 5 plans have been updated<br>(REMACOPSE, PACOCHE, REVISMEM,<br>PNM y RMISC).   |  |
| Outcome 1.3 Financial mechanism significantly improved for long-term sustainable financing of the MPA network   |   |   |                |  |  |
| Output Indicator 1.3.1:<br>Indicator 1.3.1.: FAP dedicated sub-<br>account created before the end of<br>year 2.   | Date of creation of FAP's dedicated account   | March 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2019   | CA             | On the date indicated and through an<br>ordinary session of the FIAS board,<br>the members authorized the creation<br>of the subaccount "Ecuador Azul"<br>within the Fund of Protected Areas -<br>FAP in Spanish.  |  |

| Output Indicator 1.3.2:<br>Indicator 1.3.2. Expenditure<br>management strategy under<br>implementation before the end of<br>year 1.   | Date start of implementation   | N/A                              | IS                    | This product is being developed by a specialist from CI and will be delivered on FY20, and then be implemented and assessed. |
|---|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Output Indicator 1.3.3:<br>Indicator 1.3.3. Strategy to increase<br>funding under implementation<br>before the end of year 1.   | Date start of implementation   | N/A                              | IS                    | This product is being developed by a specialist from CI and will be delivered on FY20, and then be implemented and assessed. |
| Outcome 2.1 Lessons learned from p  | ilots are fully incorporated into new,   | updated regulations and guidelin | es for MPA management |  |
| Output Indicator 2.1.1:<br>Indicator 2.1.1.a: Number of<br>governance processes and<br>organizational structures<br>functioning in coastal buffer zones<br>that applied lesson learned, new<br>and updated regulations and<br>guidelines. | Midterm target: 2  | N/A                              | NS                    | To be developed during FY20.   |
| Indicator 2.1.1.b: Perception of<br>women about their decision-<br>making impact in governance<br>processes.  | Level of impact (high, medium,<br>low, negligible) on decision-<br>making governance processes | N/A                              | NS                    | To be developed during FY20.   |

| Output Indicator 2.1.2:   |  |   |              |   |
|---|--|---|--------------|---|
| Indicator 2.1.2.a: Number of people<br>that participate in lessons learned<br>and good practices dissemination<br>events. | End of project target:<br>> 1000 people<br>≥ 50% women | N/A   | NS           | At the end of FY20 lessons learned will start being documented.   |
| Indicator 2.1.2.b: Number of people<br>that apply lessons learned and<br>good practices experiences.                      | End of project target:<br>> 300 people<br>≥ 30% women  | N/A   | NS           | At the end of FY20 lessons learned will start being documented.   |
| Outcome 3.1: Connectivity between o   | coastal mangroves and adjacent inla                    | nd habitats within the MPA netwo  | ork improved |   |
| Output Indicator 3.1.1:<br>Indicator 3.1.1.a.: Biodiversity<br>inventory for habitat connectivity<br>completed            | 1,121.8 ha total                                       | The new area under<br>sustainable management will<br>be probably 1264,8 ha. | NS           | <ul> <li>Based on the validation of the data,<br/>SGMC assessed the request from<br/>the community and probably from<br/>177 ha – Equatorial Choco<br/>mangrove they will increase to 320<br/>ha, by expanding the area under<br/>concession</li> </ul> |
| Indicator 3.1.1.b: Number of ha<br>under better management<br>(through communication material<br>and farm tools).         | End of project target > 120<br>media reports           | N/A   | NS           | <ul> <li>Pilots to be implemented during<br/>FY20</li> </ul>  |
| Indicator 3.1.1.c.: Number of stakeholder agreements  | End of project target ≥ 2                              | N/A   | IS           | <ul> <li>Pilots to be implemented during<br/>FY20</li> </ul>  |

| <b>Output Indicator 3.1.2:</b><br>Indicator 3.1.2.a.: Formal<br>instruments that adopt the<br>habitat connectivity guidelines. | End of project target ≥ 1                              | N/A | NS | Pilots to be implemented during FY20 |
|--|--|-----|----|--------------------------------------|
| Output Indicator 3.1.3:<br>Indicator 3.1.3.a.: Number of<br>downloads of lessons learned<br>document.                          | End of project target ≥ 5000                           | N/A | NS | Pilots to be implemented during FY20 |
| Output Indicator 3.1.4:<br>Indicator 3.1.4.a.: Number of<br>people that participate in<br>dissemination events.                | End of project target:<br>> 1000 people<br>≥ 50% women | N/A | NS | Pilots to be implemented during FY20 |
| Indicator 3.1.4.b.: Number of<br>downloads of guidelines<br>document.  | End of project target ≥ 5000                           | N/A | NS | Pilots to be implemented during FY20 |