



Acci?n P?ramos: conservation, restoration and sustainable use of the p?ramos in Ecuador

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11386

Countries

Ecuador

Project Name

Acci?n P?ramos: conservation, restoration and sustainable use of the p?ramos in Ecuador

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

10/17/2023

Review completed by PM

10/23/2023

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Project Overview

- 3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**
- b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

1. On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 4.93%, for a co-financing of \$24,550,068 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,210,318 instead of \$ 640,000 (which is 2.6%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

11/10/2023

Cleared.

	Sub Total (\$)	4,208,510.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ		
	GET	207,700.00
	Sub Total(\$)	207,700.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	4,416,210.00

Agency's Comments

Co-financing amount for management costs has been adjusted to be proportional to the GEF contribution.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

- a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?
- b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

- a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?
- b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?
- c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?
- d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Please complete the Section "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project" which was left blank in the portal.

Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

Does the GEF Agency expect to play an execution role on this project?

If so, please describe that role here. Also, please add a short explanation to describe cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects, including potential for co-location and/or sharing of expertise/staffing



Core Indicators

11/10/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

The section has been completed as requested.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Please update this section and use the correct name of the KMGBF. Also please identify the targets the Project will contribute to achieving.

11/10/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

This section has been edited as requested.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

11/10/2023

Cleared.

10/23/2023

Please categorize the cofinancing correctly. In-kind contributions cannot be categorized as investment mobilized, but this is categorized as recurrent expenditures. Grants or loans are investment mobilized.

Please replace ?GEF Agency to ?Donor Agency? for FAO and CI as sources of co-financing.

GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	Investment mobilized	485,000.00
GEF Agency	CI	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	150,000.00

Agency's Comments

The requested adjustments have been made.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?s(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

1. Letter of Endorsement: the template utilized for this project removed the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: *Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?*. Agencies have been informed that LoEs *with modifications cannot be accepted and will be returned?*. The removal of the footnote is not trivial as this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project. Please either a) provide a new endorsement letter that includes the footnote; or b) get an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE (this is an alternative to request a new LoE).
2. Letter of Endorsement only includes the Conservation International as the Executing Partner. However, in Portal there is an additional executing partner (Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development) that not included in the LoE. Please ask remove Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development as this is not endorsed by the Government (they can be included later during the preparation phase as needed)
3. Please remove *Foundation?* from the portal entry (which does not appear in the LoE), and instead include *Ecuador?* (which does appear in the LoE) and to change the executing partner type for *GEF Agency?* instead of CSO given that Conservation International is a GEF agency.

11/10/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

As suggested, an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE is being added to the re-submission.

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes they are but they have to be corrected per comments above.

11/10/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Same as 8.4.

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

No please see comments above and address the issues identified.

11/10/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Same as 8.4.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared. For the CEO endorsement, please also map all other Paramo investments by GEF that are ongoing in the country so that we can map the complementarity of this investment visually.

Agency's Comments

Thank you, well noted.

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

10/23/2023

No, please revise in response to comments above and resubmit as soon as possible.

11/10/2023

PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review

10/26/2023

Additional Review (as necessary)

11/10/2023

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)