

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 PIF 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.

Agenices

FAO

Date received by PM

10/12/2019

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2017

The project is aligned with the correct focal area elements in Table A.

Please revise the text in the table and use the correct language as stated in the biodiversity strategy, BD 1-1: Biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors. BD 2-7: Improving financial sustainability, effective management, and ecosystems coverage of the global protected area estate.

November 1, 2019

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response Corrected in the PIF.
Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Table B summarizes the project intervention strategy coherently and it directly responds to the barriers identified in the PIF. However, please complete the METT for the protected areas that are the target of the intervention.

November 1, 2019

Adequate clarifications. For the CEO endorsement, please convert the METT score to a number when entering. In addition, please reach out to GEFSEC to discuss the METT that Ecuador is using prior to the submission of CEO endorsement. At CEO endorsement, the project will have to complete the GEF METT but this initial assessment at PIF stage using the Ecuador METT is adequate. Cleared.

Agency Response

Adjusted in the PIF (results framework) based on the METT scores for 2018 provided by the Ministry of Environment. Ecuador has an adapted version of the METT, since 2015, which has been used to define the project targets.

<http://extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/ecu162628.pdf>

Co-financing

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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes for the most part. However, in the next version of the PIF please clarify how the figure of US\$9 million was estimated for beneficiary in-kind contributions when the PIF states that no consultations have been conducted yet with the project beneficiaries themselves.

November 1, 2019

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

Adjusted in the PIF after table C

During the initial consultation process, farmers and community leaders expressed that their working day is worth USD 20. Their estimated contribution in the Project just in meetings and training programs (field farmer's school) is 20 days a year (based on other GEF projects). The project will last 5 years and has an estimated of 8,200 beneficiaries. Actual calculations will add up to USD 16 million.

This amount does not include the time spent implementing good practices and other assets, such as land.

Besides, experience with other projects shows that once a good practice proves to be effective, farmers put more resources into the project.

The USD 9 million is a conservative estimation that will be revised during the PPG phase

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Please clarify the following issues related to hectare coverage in the Core Indicators:

- 1) In Table F, Core Indicator One should include the total area within the protected areas. Do not separate out the sustainable use areas within the protected areas as technically they are within the boundaries of the protected areas. Please complete the METT for each protected area that are the focus of the project.
- 2) In Table F, Core indicator Four should only include the area that is outside of the formally demarcated protected area. If the buffer zones are outside of the protected areas, then include this area under Core Indicator Four.
- 3) Once the numbers are clarified in Table F, please ensure that the area is consistently reported in the section on GEBs.

November 1, 2019

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

Adjusted in PIF section F and section on GEBs (paragraph 54).

- Indicator 1 (889,715 ha) is the combined total area of the Cayambe Coca and Sangay PAs, which includes 24,836 ha as the combined total area of the sustainable use areas.

- Indicator 4 (8,000 ha) is the combined total area of the projected buffer zone, where the project will intervene directly in the Cayambe Coca and Sangay PAs

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

No. Please complete the appropriate Rio Markers.

November 1, 2019

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response Completed in the PIF.

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes. The problem description and articulation of barriers and the opportunities that this provides for a GEF investment are clear and compelling. Cleared.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes, the thematic, temporal, spatial and project baseline is adequately described. Cleared.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes, alternative scenario is clearly articulated. Cleared.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes the project is closely aligned with BD 1-1, and BD 2-7. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes. Incremental reasoning logic is sound and adequately presented. Cleared.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

For the total amount of resources being invested, \$US 25 million, the objectives and GEBs are quite modest and one would think that more area could be covered and greater benefits achieved for this amount of money. Please clarify why the cost (about \$27 per hectare) will be so high given that the PAs are already established.

November 1, 2019

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

While the parks have already been established, the innovative approach of the Project will consider actions that were not been implemented before, mainly in the sustainable development areas.

Other projects outside PAs indicate a cost of USD400 per hectare for the implementation of good practices. Given the cofinancing, price will be less for this project.

In addition, intervening in such big protected areas also represents a high cost in mobility for trainings and meetings.

Demarcation of the sustainable development areas and buffer zones will require investment as well.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

The project is innovative in that it is helping implement new policies in Ecuador where sustainable use will be legally possible by communities that live within the protected areas. The project intervention approach could be scaled up across an array of PAs in Ecuador where communities are living within existing protected areas, however, the project does not articulate a clear pathway to scaling and how this would be realized which is a missing element in the project design. Please address this gap in the next revision of the PIF.

November 1, 2019

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response Adjusted in the project outputs (paragraphs 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45 and 47) and in the Scaling Up section (paragraph 59).
Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

While the PIF provides a strategy and plans for future engagement of stakeholders (communities and indigenous peoples) that live within the protected areas and that are the primary project beneficiaries, no consultations have taken place with this stakeholder group to date. In this type of project where they are the key project beneficiaries, actors, and change-agents in the project, the absence of engagement of this stakeholder group can not be accepted at the PIF stage.

Please resubmit the PIF after at least an initial consultation has been conducted with the in-situ stakeholders within each protected area.

November 1, 2019

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

As part of the PIF design and adjustment an initial local consultation process took place on October 24th-25th, 2019 for Cayambe-Coca PA and on October 29th and 30th, 2019 for Sangay PA.

It is described in paragraphs 61-64 of the PIF.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes, the gender context within rural Ecuador and how the project will take that into account during the project design phase is elaborated, however, the lack of any initial consultation with the communities residing within the protected areas raises questions on the gender analysis undertaken thus far and how that can be most effectively incorporated into project design. Please revise this section after an initial consultation is done per the stakeholder consultation comments presented previously.

November 1, 2019

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response Adjusted in PIF, paragraphs 66 and 67.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes and a initial strategy is proposed and potential partners identified. Cleared.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes for the most part; however, since the key project stakeholder (communities and indigenous peoples living within protected areas) have yet to be initially consulted, this risk associated with communities should be listed as high. Please revise again after undertaking an initial consultation with these key stakeholders.

November 1, 2019

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response Adjusted in table #3, based on the consultation process.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes, this is adequate at this stage. Cleared.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes, this project is fully consistent with national planning documents as well as with the country's NBSAP. Cleared.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

No, the KM approach is very generic, could apply to almost any project, and does not elaborate sufficiently on how the opportunity provided by this project and what is learned will systematically be codified and disseminated to the many other protected areas in the SNAP that have the similar challenge of promoting sustainable use within PA boundaries. Please revise the KM strategy and elaborate more on the KM approach vis a vis this specific project and the problems it is addressing.

November 1, 2019

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

Adjusted in PIF, paragraph 78.

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 15, 2019

No, not at this time. Please address all issues raised comprehensively and resubmit.

November 1, 2019

Adequate clarifications and revisions have been provided. The PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review

--	--	--

--	--	--

	PIF Review	Agency Response
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		