

# Effective Conservation of Protected Areas of Galapagos, through Strengthening of Control and Surveillance of the Galapagos Marine Reserve and the Eradication of Invasive Predators from Floreana Island

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10807

**Countries**

Ecuador

**Project Name**

Effective Conservation of Protected Areas of Galapagos, through  
Strengthening of Control and Surveillance of the Galapagos Marine Reserve  
and the Eradication of Invasive Predators from Floreana Island

**Agencies**

CAF

**Date received by PM**

3/29/2021

**Review completed by PM**

5/13/2021

**Program Manager**

Mark Zimsky

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

MSP

## CEO Approval Request

### Part I ? Project Information

**1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**2. Project description summary. 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

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response

**4. Co-financing. Are the confirmed 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, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

In kind contribution from Island Conservation is not investment mobilized but should be categorized as recurrent expenditures.

Blue Action Fund should be categorized as a donor.

5/3/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response 4/29/2021 Corresponding changes have been made to Table C of the CEO doc.

**5. GEF resource availability. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response

**SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response  
**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response  
**6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response  
**7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response  
**8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/1/2021

Please fix the METT score which is currently listed as 2,330 as this is not possible. This number is in a number of places in the core indicators on the portal for METT scores.

5/3/2021

Cleared for the marine METT score.

However, for indicator 1.2, the investment in removing a threat to biodiversity in terrestrial ecosystems will have an impact on the management effectiveness of the protected area, hence on the METT score. The rationale that the investments in the protected area fall under 2.7 do not make sense.

Please revise the proposal and include a baseline score for the METT since the target of the intervention is the protected area, not productive landscapes.

Please explain in the footnote to the core indicators why the project is unable to provide indicators for Core Indicator 11. Please also reconsider the analysis of project impact on project beneficiaries and adjust core indicator 11 as necessary.

5/12/2021

Cleared.

#### Agency Response

4/29/2021

The baseline METT score of 73 has been revised on the portal.

5/07/2021

The submission documents include the following changes, in response to these comments:

? A second METT has been added (see TT, Tab II-2), for Galapagos National Park, and section I of the tracking tool has been revised accordingly.

? METT target for Galapagos National Park has been added as an objective-level indicator to results frameworks in both documents

? Core indicator 1.2 (see table F and Annex F) have been added to cover the 789,088 terrestrial area of the National Park

**9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Project Description. Is there 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

4/1/2021

Yes.

Please also clarify where in the document does it state how all associated capture and destruction methods will follow internationally accepted standards of humanely handling and disposing of animals.

5/3/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/29/2021

The following sentence has been added to the Prodoc and CEO doc: ?The operational plan follows international best practice for IAS eradication, including processes for the humane treatment and disposal of species that will be eradicated.? (CEO doc, p.23; Prodoc p.34)

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

Please provide a better description on how this project is related to the numerous previous investments on IAS in the Galapagos, how it builds on these and in particular the relationship operationally speaking with project # 9282.

5/3/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/29/2021

A brief overview has been provided of past GEF support to IAS in the Galapagos (CEO doc, p.17; Prodoc, p.23). In addition, the description of the baseline situation regarding financial sustainability for IAS (which received support from one of the previous GEF projects) has been strengthened (CEO doc, p. 16-17; ProDoc p.22-23).

Regarding the operational relationship with 9282, the timing and nature of the hand over across projects is summarized (CEO doc. p.17, 24; Prodoc, p.23, 36).

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**4. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

Yes. But please see comment above on the baseline investments by GEF.



5/3/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/29/2021

Baseline investments, particularly from GEF, have been more fully described (see above).

**6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

The GEF has invested a considerable amount of resources in the management of the Galapagos and more recently in address specific IAS issues. Please clarify the sustainability strategy for IAS management going forward so that the park can manage IAS going forward without relying on external assistance.

5/3/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/29/2021

Component 3 includes the word "Sustainability" in its title because of the great importance ascribed to financial sustainability for the project and its proponents. Work under this component has the potential to substantially reduce long-term financial

dependence on external funding for invasive species eradication (CEO document, p.35; ProDoc p.54).

**8. 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  
4/1/2021

Please provide more detailed maps of Floreana and identify where on the island the eradications will take place.

5/3/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/29/2021

A map of Floreana Island has been added to Section 1A of the CEO document. The idea of the eradications is of course to remove 100% of the invasive species in question from the entire island. In the case of invasive rodents and cats, this will require baiting across the full extent of the island. For this reason, it is not possible to show specific locations on a map.

Coordinates have also been provided for Floreana.

**9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response

**10. 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

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**11. 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

5/18/2021

It is well noted that this project has considered gender dimensions and incorporated plans to address gender gaps (briefly described in the agency project document). We can not locate the gender analysis or gender mainstreaming plan. Please provide the gender analysis and action plan.

7/8/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

01/05/2021

A gender analysis and mainstreaming plan has been added as Annex 11 to the CAF project document.

**12. 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

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**13. Risk. 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

4/1/2021

Please provide a description on how the project will manage the risk posed by COVID-19 to project implementation.

5/3/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/29/2021

A description of COVID-19 related risks and associated mitigation measures has been added to the risk table (CEO doc., p.46)

**14. 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

4/1/2021

Yes but as noted above please provide more details on the relationship operationally speaking to this investment and project 9282.

5/3/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/29/2021

The operational relationship has been described more fully (CEO doc, p. 17 & 23; Prodoc p. 23)

**15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**16. 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

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**17. 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

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**18. 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

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**19. Annexes:**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2021

Please submit a proper Annex E in the portal. CAF may want to look at their submission for project 10295 as an example of what is acceptable in terms of the presentation of expenditures per component.

5/12/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

5/11/2021

A more detailed budget (Annex E) is in the portal (Roadmap-documents). It details the expenditures per component of the project.

**20. 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

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response  
**Council comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response  
**STAP comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response  
**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response  
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response  
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
4/1/2021

See above for request for better detailed map of intervention sites on Floreana.

5/3/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response  
4/29/2021

As noted above, a map of Floreana Island has been added to Section 1A of the CEO document, as well as to Annex E.

**Part III ? Country and Agency Endorsements**

**1. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**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

4/1/2021

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

4/1/2021

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

4/1/2021

NA.

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**1. RECOMMENDATION.**

**Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/1/2021

No. Please revise sections above as indicated and resubmit.

5/3/2021

No. Please revise the core indicators as referenced above and resubmit.

5/11/2021

No. Please submit a proper Annex E in the portal. CAF may want to look at their submission for project 10295 as an example of what is acceptable.

5/18/2021

Please address comment on gender above and the following issues.

1. On Project Information: Please correct the expected completion date to 10/14/2026 in order to match the 60 month duration.
2. Please round the numbers in Portal for both the GEF Financing and Agency Fee as is the norm in GEF project submissions.
3. On M&E: Audits have been charged to the M&E budget. Please correct and charge M&E to the PMC.

4. On the Budget:

The budget included in the Annex E is missing a large part of the information provided in the Attached budget in the portal. Please include the entire budget table in Annex E (they can provide info per component instead of per output to make the table slimmer).

5. Financial audit and Finance/Human resources Manager has been charged to the component along other items that should be charged to the PMC (cell phone, it support, computers, etc.). Per GEF practice please separate those items and provide differentiated costs for the operational items, Audits, Finance/Human resources Manager. We request CAF to make sure the budget submission follows our standard practices.

7/8/2021

No. On Project Information: Please correct the expected completion date to 10/14/2026 in order to match the 60 month duration. It is currently listed as 10/14/2021.

7/8/2021

Yes. Project is recommended for CEO approval.

**Review Dates**

	<b>1SMSP CEO Approval</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>4/1/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/3/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/11/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/18/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>7/8/2021</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**