

Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity within the sustainable use areas of the State Subsystem of Protected Areas (SEAP) of Ecuador and its buffer zones.

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10396

Countries

Ecuador

Project Name

Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity within the sustainable use areas of the State Subsystem of Protected Areas (SEAP) of Ecuador and its buffer zones.

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

8/27/2021

Review completed by PM

11/17/2021

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

As requested at PIF, please confirm that the scores entered are using the GEF METT.

10/23/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 22, 2021:

Yes. This is confirmed. This has now been clarified throughout the text on the GEF Portal and attached Agency Project Document.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

The large amount of "in-kind" amount from FIAS does not make any sense given that FIAS is a fund that grants money to projects. It seems most appropriate that this be labeled a grant and classified as investment mobilized. Please revise accordingly.

10/28/2021

a. FIAS: change the source from ?Private sector? to ?Other?.

b. FAO \$430,000: as per the co-financing letter, change to ?In-kind? and ?Recurrent expenditures?.

11/16/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

November 12, 2021

- a. The Source of FIAS co-financing has been updated as requested.
- b. The Type of co-financing from FAO has been updated to In-Kind/Recurrent expenditures in line with co-financing letter, as requested.

October 22, 2021:

Noted. The FIAS co-financing has been re-labeled as suggested. A revised co-financing letter is now uploaded in the GEF Portal.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

As noted above, please confirm that the METT scores are derived from the application of the GEF METT.

10/23/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 22, 2021:

Yes. This is confirmed. This has now been clarified throughout the text on the GEF Portal and attached Agency Project Document (Please refer to table B, alternative scenario section, global environmental benefits section, and results framework).

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

The map is clear. Please provide locations of sites, per the portal instructions.

10/23/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 22, 2021:

The location of sites is now included on the Portal and on the attached project document.

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/28/2021

NA

Agency Response
Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/28/2021

Budget table: unspecified miscellaneous and contingencies expenses are to be paid by the co-financing portion. Please revise.

11/16/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

November 12, 2021

The line ?miscellaneous and contingencies? has been deleted.

Please refer to the updated budget (GEF Portal Annex E, Agency project document Annex A2, and uploaded budget to GEF Portal Documentation) to see the updated budget.

In addition,

The Expected completion date has been updated in the GEF portal and attached agency project document as requested.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Comments were provided by USA, Norway and Germany on this project, but no responses are provided in the documentation. Please include in the revision.

10/23/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 22, 2021:

The responses to comments provided by USA, Norway and Germany have been included in Annex B (Responses to Project Reviews) of the Project Document and the section has been updated in the Portal.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/28/2021

NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/28/2021

NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/28/2021

NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

Map is clear. Please provide coordinates of project sites.

10/23/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

October 22, 2021:

Coordinates have been included, as requested.

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/28/2021

No. Please address the issues above and resubmit.

10/28/2021

Please address the remaining issues identified above including these below:

Expected Completion Date is wrong ? 60 months from 3/1/2022 is 2/28/2027
? please correct.

Budget table: unspecified miscellaneous and contingencies expenses are to be paid by the co-financing portion. Please revise.

11/16/2021

All issues have been addressed. Unfortunately The Budget Table in Annex E of Portal is off the margins ? if not corrected, the table will not be complete in the CEO Endorsement Portal's view by the time of CEO Endorsement, when the documents need to be posted. Please revise the formatting so that the Annex E budget table can be viewed.

11/17/2021

Yes, it is recommended for CEO endorsement. Formatting issues addressed in the portal.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	9/28/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/28/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/16/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/17/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

In this project Ecuador proposes to implement an efficient management model for the State Subsystem of Protected Areas (SEAP) that meets conservation objectives, considers social participation, and ensures the sustainable use of environmental goods and services, and stable and long-term financing.

To that end, the project has been organized into four components: 1) Strengthening of the national governance of the SEAP for the management of protected areas with emphasis on their sustainable use zones; 2) Development of local territorial governance to prevent the loss of biodiversity in the buffer zones of Protected Areas; 3) Improvement of livelihoods to reduce pressure on ecosystem services and biodiversity

in the Cayambe Coca National Park (PNCC) and Sangay National Park (PNS); and 4) Knowledge management and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) based on the principles of adaptive management and the delivery of measurable and objectively verifiable results.

The project will generate global environmental benefits, in addition to socioeconomic benefits: 1) Improved management of the PNCC and the PNS expressed in the increase in the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool score: a) PNCC (486,612 has) from 45 to 65; b) PNS (403,103 has): from 43 to 55; 2) 6,000 hectares in sustainable use zones and buffer zones of PNCC and PNS where conservation and sustainable use practices of the BD are implemented (sustainable production, tourism, restoration and conservation); 3) Enhanced capacities of: i) 60 technical officials and park rangers of the Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition (MAATE) at the national level for the operation and maintenance of the integrated information system; ii) 80 technicians and park rangers from the PNCC and PNS to use the integrated information system and new or updated secondary regulations developed by the project; iii) 1,200 residents (30% women) living in the sustainable use zones of the PNCC and PNS, including women, youths and indigenous peoples, who know and understand the regulations and instruments for the management of sustainable use zones in the PNCC and PNS; iv) at least 600 people (30% women, 30% youths) to implement and monitor the regulations and tools for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity developed by the project; v) 120 technicians and extension workers from the MAATE, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG) and Decentralized Autonomous Governments (DAG) trained to implement good practices for the conservation and sustainable use of the BD (of which 40% are women); vi) 3,000 people (at least 40% are women) to implement practices for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

Project implementation will consider the impact of COVID-19 pandemic at the local level. Given the impacts on local livelihoods caused by COVID-19, the project will channel efforts that contribute to the food security of small producers in the short term and increase their resilience in the context of global environmental change and external shocks. The project will apply the corresponding security measures and protocols to safeguard the health of both direct participants (including project staff) and rural communities. The following aspects will be taken into account: i) Continuous risk analysis and identification of response measures; ii) Implementation of government regulations and protocols in coordination with MAATE as the leading national authority for the project; iii) Continuous monitoring of the official information on the epidemiological curve in each of the intervention sites and the restrictions that may be imposed by the national or local authorities in the areas selected for intervention; iv) The Project Implementation Unit will develop biosafety protocols for both project staff and participants in project activities and will be responsible for broad dissemination to all stakeholders; v) Digital media will be used as an alternative mechanism for organizing workshops and meetings with national and sub-national partners, and looking for a way to effectively incorporate groups of beneficiaries; vi) Opportunities and concrete

mechanisms will be identified in which the project can participate in coordination with the national institutions in the intervention areas to face the health situation.