



# Integrated landscape management in the Napo River Basin for sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation.

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11333

**Countries**

Ecuador

**Project Name**

Integrated landscape management in the Napo River Basin for sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation.

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

10/11/2023

**Review completed by PM**

1/18/2024

**Program Manager**

Pascal Martinez

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**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

**October 30, 2023:**

- a) Yes, cleared.
- b) On "Sector (only for Programs on CC)", please include "AFOLU" as the PFD addendum includes CCM funds.

**November 30, 2023:**

- b) Thank you for completing the table. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

- b) Thanks for your comment. Your request was addressed.

**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

**October 30, 2023:**

1. The Napo River Basin is said to be "the largest in the Amazon". Please verify this statement considering all the other river basins in the Amazon region.

2. The summary says the project will benefit to 6,715 families while the core indicator 11 mentions 6,715 people. Please clarify and ensure the information is consistent.

**November 30, 2023:**

1. and 2. Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

**Agency's Comments**

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

1. Thanks for your comment. The text was adjusted as follows: The Napo River Basin is the largest in the Ecuadorian Amazon region.

2. The correct number is 7,676 people or direct beneficiaries. This was corrected in the core indicator 11 and Outcome 2.1.

**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**

**October 31, 2023:**

a) Yes, cleared.

b)

b.1. "Life Plans" is mentioned 13 times in the Portal entry including in the Indicative Project Overview (output 1.1.3 and 3.1.3) but we don't find clarification of what these plans are about. Please ensure a presentation of these Life Plans is provided.

b.2. The Indicative Project Overview table includes some GEF core indicators but not all. Please explain why only some of them are provided or include them all to be consistent.

b.3. The outcome "2.1: Areas under conservation..." is formulated as an indicator and not as outcome. Please reformulate as an outcome.

b.4. As formulated, the difference between the output 2.1.1 and 2.1.3 is unclear (both are about formulation and implementation of plans/instruments). Please clarify these outputs.

b.5. The outcome 2.2 and its related outputs are missing in the Indicative Project Overview table. Please complete the table as needed.

b.6. Although it is an important and expected co-benefit, climate change adaptation is not directly supported by the CCM FA of the GEF Trust Fund. Please consider removing "adaptation" in the Portal entry wherever it appears as a main objective of GEF investment such as in the title of component 3 and of the outcome 2.1.3. In the title of component 3, we suggest to replace climate change adaptation by biodiversity to be consistent with the title of the outcome 3.1.

b.7. In Indicative Project Overview table, the sum of the beneficiaries in component 1, 3 and 4 (3,450) doesn't match with the number reported in core indicator section (6,715). Please clarify.

b.8. The title of the outcome 3.1.2 is unclear: will the "financial sustainability mechanisms" be selected, promoted, developed and/or implemented? Please clarify.

b.9. While there are two outputs on M&E, the GEF-8 Indicative Project Overview table has a complete component for M&E (see below) ? please include the M&E parts (outputs ? outcomes ? GEF resources, among others) in the M&E component.

4. Knowledge management, dissemination of lessons learned, monitoring and evaluation	Technical Assistance	4.1. Knowledge management and dissemination of lessons learned. GEF Core indicator 11: 1,000 direct beneficiaries of institutions disaggregated by sex (40% women)	4.1.1. Strengthening of the hydrometeorological network and the information chain for the development of early warning systems. 4.1.2. Training program on land degradation neutrality, climate change, biodiversity, gender, and intersectionality. 4.1.3. Educational and communication strategy that supports implementation of land degradation neutrality, climate change and biodiversity. 4.2.1 Monitoring of risks identified by the social and environmental screening procedure and implementation of mitigation actions. 4.2.2 Monitoring and reporting of project results framework 4.2.3 Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation of the Project.	GET	1,494,420.00	7,441,801.00
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	--------------	--------------

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

**November 30, 2023:**

Thank you for the clarification in all comments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

b.1. Thanks for your comment. Output 1.1.3 includes a footnote defining 'Life Plans' as instruments for planning and financing the development of indigenous peoples and nationalities. Life Plans are a key provision of the 'Organic Law for the Comprehensive Planning of the Special Amazon Territorial Circumscription'. Life plans address the following elements of great importance for indigenous communities: indigenous worldview, territory, diversity, bioeconomy, sacred basins, autonomy, and governance.

b.2. The indicative project overview table now includes all core indicators. The only one missing was the GEF Core Indicator 6, which was included in Outcome 2.2.

b.3. Outcome 2.1 now states: 'Native forests and basins are preserved with conservation and sustainable forest management mechanisms and gender mainstreaming?'

b.4. Changes have been made to clarify the difference between output 2.1.1 and 2.1.3. The revised outputs read as follows:

2.1.1. Management plans formulated and/or updated for water protection areas and implementation of measures for sustainable management that contribute to avoiding LD and protecting water resources in the upper basin of the Napo River.

2.1.3. Management plans formulated and /or updated for protective forests or other forms of protection in territories such as forests of indigenous communities present in the lower Napo River basin, incorporating measures for SFM.

b.5. Outcome 2.2 and its related outputs have been added to the portal in the Indicative Project Overview Table section.

b.6 Adaptation has been removed from Component 3 and Output 2.1.3. Adaptation will be a co-benefit of the implementation as noted by the GEF reviewer in his comment.

b.7. The number of direct beneficiaries (people) in the Indicative Project Overview now totals 7,676 (C1: 250; C2: 961; C2: 3265; C3: 2,200; C4: 1,000).

b.8 Output 3.1.2 has been adjusted as follows: 'Financial sustainability mechanisms identified and promoted with women and men for the protection and conservation of selected areas and water protection zones?'

b.9 M&E is now a separate component (I.e., Component 5) which includes its own outcomes, outputs, GEF resources and co-financing.

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

## Secretariat's Comments

**October 31, 2023:**

Gender dimension seems to be considered only in the component 4 (except for the core indicator 11). Please make clearer in all the project description that it is also taken into account in the description of the other components. In particular, please consider the gender dimensions in the following Outputs: 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 3.1.1, 3.1.4, 4.1.3, 4.2.2 and 4.2.3.

**November 30, 2023:**

Thank you for mainstreaming gender consideration throughout the project description.  
Cleared.

## Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

Thanks for your comment. Gender has been mainstreamed throughout the document and in the outputs mentioned by the GEF reviewer.

**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

**October 31, 2023:**

Yes, cleared.

## Agency's Comments

### **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

**October 31, 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

**October 31, 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

**October 31, 2023:**

a)

a.1. Please clarify what " GADs" and "PDOT" mean the first time they appear in the project description.

a.2. Please don't use "NDT" but the acronym in English.

a.3. Please correct the typo "biodiversity conservationmponent 1: Multilevel governance and articulation framework for territorial management."

a.4. Under component 3, the number of the outcome "1.1. Scaling up of measures ..." is wrong. Please correct.

a.5. Timber is mentioned with the private sector engagement. Please clarify what are the timber-related activities envisioned in the project and note that timber-related activities are not eligible unless at small scale and associated with IPLC.

a.6. On component 4, please see below under "5.3 Implementation Framework" the comment on knowledge management and communication strategy.

**November 30, 2023:**

Thank you for the clarification and corrections. Cleared.

#### Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

a.1. Thanks for the comment. The GADs and PDOT acronyms have been defined the first time they appear in the PIF. They are under the Theory of Change and Incremental cost reasoning headings.

a.2. Corrected as suggested by the GEF reviewer to LDN.

a.3. Typo corrected.

a.4. Numbering corrected.

a.5.. Timber has been removed from this section.

a.6. Component 4 has been adjusted as mentioned in the relevant comment under section 5.3. "Implementation Framework".

#### **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

**October 31, 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

**October 31, 2023:**

a) The rationale for the institutional setting is missing in the Portal entry and the exact role of the MAAT is unclear. Please elaborate on these 2 aspects.

b) In section "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project", the Agency mentions that they expect to play an execution role in this project. The Agency explained that "The UNDP CO in Ecuador complies with the policy regarding the separation of functions of oversight vs execution. The CO will hire a Project Management Unit which will be in charge of the execution of the project's activities and there will be total separation of functions between oversight and execution." Please note that this justification is not enough to definitely approve the exceptional arrangement. The clearance of this PIF cannot be taken as the final approval of the implementing agency to execute the project because further analysis will be conducted with the complete elaboration of the project.

Also, the LoE does not mention UNDP as one of the executing partners (only the Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition is mentioned). This needs to be clarified.

#### Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

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

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

The UNDP CO in Ecuador complies with the policy regarding the separation of functions of oversight vs execution. The CO will hire a Project Management Unit which will be in charge of the execution of the project's activities and there will be total separation of functions between oversight and execution.

Subject: Endorsement for the "Integrated landscape management in the Napo River Basin for sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation." Project

In my capacity as GEF Operational Focal Point for Ecuador, I confirm that the above project proposal (a) is in accordance with my government's national priorities, including, the priorities identified in the National Development Plan, the National Adaptation Plan and the REDD+ Action Plan of Ecuador, and our commitment to the relevant global environmental conventions; and (b) was discussed with relevant stakeholders, including the global environmental convention focal points.

I am pleased to endorse the preparation of the above project proposal with the support of the GEF Implementing Agency listed below. If approved, the preparation of the proposal will be supported by, and the project **executed** by Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition of Ecuador (MAATE). I request the GEF Implementing Agency to provide a copy of the project document before it is submitted to the GEF Secretariat for CEO endorsement / Approval.

c) Ongoing GEF and non-GEF initiatives are identified but the potential coordination and cooperation with this project is unclear. Please clarify.

d) The knowledge management and dissemination of lessons learned are included in component 4 (outcome 4.1). Nevertheless, the outputs under this component are about the development of early warning systems, training program and education. It is not clear how the project will capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs from the project. Please elaborate on this aspect and clarify how it contributes to the communication strategy of the project.

**November 30, 2023:**

a) Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

b) Thank you for the amended Letter of Endorsement. The proposed arrangement will be further assessed during the PPG phase. Cleared.

c) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

d) Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

**Agency's Comments**

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

a) Thanks for the comment. The rationale for the institutional setting has been added to the portal.

This is the same 'Rationale' included in the email that was submitted to GEF Sec to request approval for execution of this project, which states:

The government of Ecuador has requested UNDP to facilitate the services under the UNDP's support to National Implementation Modality (NIM) for this GEF-8 project. In this context, UNDP will create an account and facilitate payments for all expenses authorized by the Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition (MAATE); and will hire a Project Management Unit, comprised of a national team, employing an open

and transparent hiring process, which will be in charge of the execution of the project's activities. There will be total full separation of functions between oversight and execution.

MAATE's role under this setting will exercise complete authority over the project, with one of its key roles involving the evaluation and endorsement of all project documents such as ToRs, products, and strategies. However, their responsibilities will not extend to overseeing contracting or serving as contract administrators. This deliberate division of tasks enables them to focus exclusively on gaining comprehensive knowledge of the technical processes, empowering and strengthening their expertise without the encumbrance of administrative and financial responsibilities.

The alternative to a support to NIM would be a full NIM, where the funding would be transferred to the government, and the government would need to create an account for the project. It should be noted that when the GEF fund is managed through State accounts (Full NIM), it must comply with all the guidelines issued by the Ministry of Finance and Economy for all public institutions. Some of the limitations associated with these guidelines include:

? Impossibility of increasing the current government expenditure on staff, meaning that project personnel cannot be hired. This would mean that the project would have to be implemented with staff already working for the MAATE, further increasing their workload.? Impossibility of contracting consultancies, leaving only the purchase of goods viable. This would make the project unable to meet several of its objectives for which companies and consultants are needed to support the implementation.

? Complexities of setting up a single exclusive account within the public system that the project must have for managing the funds.

See the following link:

[PIMS 9648 Ecuador\\_ NAPO River Basin GEF Approval UNDP Support](#)

b) Thanks for the comment. Pursuant to the government's request, UNDP submitted a request to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) seeking support for the project's

execution. For confirmation of GEF's approval, kindly refer to the email notification accessible through the following link:

[PIMS 9648 Ecuador\\_ NAPO River Basin GEF Approval UNDP Support](#)

Furthermore, an updated LoE letter that explicitly designates UNDP as one of the executing partners has been signed by the OFP. The revised LoE has been uploaded to the portal for reference and review.

c) Thanks for the comment. Text on coordination and cooperation between this project and ongoing GEF and non-GEF initiatives has been included in the PIF. It is important to mention that the REM project has been removed from the PIF as it will be closing in 2024.

d) Thanks for the comment. Component 4 has been re-adjusted. It includes the following 3 outputs:

4.1.1. Strengthening of the hydrometeorological network and the information chain for the development of early warning systems.

4.1.2. Capacity development and training program on land degradation neutrality, climate change, biodiversity, gender equality, and intersectionality.

4.1.3 Communication strategy developed and implemented.

**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

**October 30, 2023:**

1. Under core indicator 1, the table includes 10,000 ha of newly created PA and 115,000 ha of improved management effectiveness of PA. This is not consistent with the description below the core indicator table and the project summary which refer to respectively 25,000 ha and 100,000 ha. Please clarify and be consistent.

2. The expected result in terms of GHG mitigation appears relatively low. In addition, it is expected to be indirect rather than direct and the duration of accounting is 3 years instead of 20 years as recommended in GEF guidelines. Please clarify the core indicator 6.1: 1. indicating the methodology used for the assessment and providing the calculation; 2. justifying or changing the choice of indirect mitigation; and 3. correcting the duration of accounting.

**November 30, 2023:**

1. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

2. We take note of the methodology used considering the local context and uncertainty and the plan to further assess the GHG emission mitigation during the PPG phase. Cleared.

**Agency's Comments**

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

1. Thanks for the comment. Indicator 1 was clarified as follows: This indicator encompasses a total of 125,000 hectares, comprising 10,000 hectares of newly established terrestrial protected areas and 115,000 hectares under improved practices.

2. A detailed analysis of the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) mitigation indicator has been conducted, resulting in the revision of the core indicator 6.1 to 605,643 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq. The methodology employed for this assessment and calculation has been thoroughly outlined in the PIF. It should be noted that the FAO Ex-Act tool was not used due to its inability to capture the intricacies of the Ecuadorian Amazon, as evidenced by the PROAmazonia experience. Instead, a MAATE methodology, slated for completion in February 2024, has been utilized. This methodology is applied to nascent initiatives in alignment with the national REDD+ action plan, emphasizing forest conservation and sustainable production. It ensures that calculations resonate with local and regional nuances while adhering to evolving methodologies and standards.

Importantly, as the project development phase progresses, a further calculation will be undertaken, specifically based on the prioritized areas of intervention and impacts for each activity promoted within the project framework, encompassing conservation, sustainable production, and restoration. This subsequent calculation will attribute the results to the direct efforts of the project. It is crucial to note that, due to the high level of uncertainty in the 20-year projection, this estimate will be refined when updated official data becomes available from the Ministry of Environment. As the last available information is from the 2020-2022 period, it is currently under review and discussion, taking into account the

influence of the pandemic on new local deforestation processes. Given the historically high levels of deforestation in the project area, a specific methodology is currently being reviewed in collaboration with UNDP experts to estimate emission reductions resulting from the GCF project titled "Promotion of financial and land use planning instruments for the reduction of emissions and deforestation". The methodology will be designed to estimate emissions from new initiatives that contribute to the forest conservation and sustainable production policy outlined in the national REDD+ action plan. Once this methodology is approved (anticipated in February 2024), it will be incorporated to refine the calculations presented in this document. This adjustment will be based on prioritized areas for the execution of actions related to the Napo River basin and a 20-year projection. This iterative and adaptive approach ensures that the calculations align with the local and regional reality while conforming to evolving methodologies and standards.

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

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

**October 30, 2023:**

1. The climate risk is not well identified. The description is vague stating "there are climate risks associated with events, such as heavy rains, intense temperatures...". At this stage, more clarification on threats and impacts are needed to be able to consider appropriate mitigation measures. Please outline the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location or at country level if not available at local scale (including a time horizon, ideally 2050, if the data is available) and list key potential hazards for the project that are related to the climate scenarios. For further guidance, the Agency may want to refer to STAP guidance available here: <https://www.stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening>.

2. For the climate risk, please remove the repeated text in "Impact: 3 Probability: 3 Impact: 3 Probability: 3" .

3. In the risk table, please clarify what the scale/number of "Impact" and "Probability" means.

**November 30, 2023:**

1. The additional information remains succinct but is accepted at this stage. Further analysis will be expected during the PPG phase. Cleared.

2 and 3. Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

**Agency's Comments**

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

1. Thanks for the comment. In anticipation of climate risks in the Napo River basin by 2050, which are primarily associated with intense rainfall leading to floods and adverse impacts on crop production, the project will address these challenges. Specifically, under Component 2, drainage works on farms will be implemented, coupled with capacity-building processes. This approach aims to enhance the resilience of agriculture in the face of climate fluctuations. Additionally, under Component 3, the project will utilize financial incentives to support drainage actions within farms, along with training processes focused on the management of waterlogged soils. These activities are designed as mitigation measures to alleviate the impact of climate-related challenges on agricultural productivity in the region.

2. Repeated text has been removed.

3. STAP GEF Guidelines have been revised and the scores of the risks table adjusted accordingly.

**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**

**October 31, 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

**October 30, 2023:**

Under the CCM FA, the objective 1.4 is to " Promote nature-based solutions with high mitigation potential". Nevertheless, the description is unclear on the high mitigation potential of the project and also this doesn't look consistent with the very low expected result of the project in terms of GHG mitigation (core indicator 6.1). Please clarify how the project aligns with the objective 1.4 of the CCM FA providing high mitigation potential.

**November 30, 2023:**

The expected result in terms of climate change mitigation (core indicator 6.1) doesn't look very consistent with a high mitigation potential investment (objective 1.4 of the CCM FA). The alignment will need to be better demonstrated during the PPG. Cleared.

#### Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

Thanks for the comment. The GHG mitigation indicator has been adjusted in the 'Core Indicators' section and further details on how the project aligns with CCM FA to achieve high mitigation potential have been included under the 'Alignment with GEF 8 Programming Strategies' section.

**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

**October 30, 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

**October 30, 2023:**

Partially. The proposal does clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project will contribute but it doesn't mention how it will contribute to each of the identified targets. Please clarify this aspect too.

**November 30, 2023:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

Thanks for the comment. The following text has been inserted in the Multilateral Environmental Agreements section:

Through the implementation of sustainable forest management, conservation, restoration and sustainable agroproductive practices, this project aims to contribute to targets 5, 8, 9 and 10 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. These initiatives will provide capacity building, technical assistance to indigenous peoples (through free and informed prior consultation processes) and local communities to ensure that different forest flora and fauna species are managed sustainably, maintaining the nature's contribution to the Amazonian ecosystem.

#### **7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

Secretariat's Comments

**October 30, 2023:**

Partially. Please see the comments below.

**December 7, 2023:**

No, please see below the comment on the stakeholders' consultation.

**January 18, 2024:**

Thank you for addressing the comment. Cleared.

#### Agency's Comments

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

#### Secretariat's Comments

**October 30, 2023:**

1. No. The description of consultations conducted is required at PIF stage. As per the Policy, the PIF submitted to the GEF Secretariat should provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development, as well as information on how Stakeholders will be engaged in the project preparation and implementation phases. Please see the GEF guidelines

here: [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Stakeholder\\_Engagement\\_Guidelines.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Stakeholder_Engagement_Guidelines.pdf) and complete as required.

2. In particular, it is noted that consultations so far have not included relevant NGOs, local communities, CSOs or private sector partners. Taking this into consideration, the agency should provide some additional information on how these relevant stakeholders, including relevant CSO and local community groups will be engaged and consulted in project development to inform project components.

**December 7, 2023:**

We take note of the clarification. Nevertheless, for any project proposal a consultation of the involved stakeholders is required. Please conduct this consultation and present it clearly in the relevant section "Stakeholder Engagement" of the Portal entry (including dates of consultation, stakeholders consulted, outcomes of the consultation, roles to project outcomes and plan to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan before CEO endorsement).

**January 18, 2024:**

Thank you for the additional clarification. Cleared.

#### Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

1 and 2. Thanks for the comments. Given time constraints, UNDP was unable to initiate consultations with relevant NGOs, local communities, CSOs, or private sector partners before the PIF submission. However, UNDP intends to capitalize on the established relationships with local stakeholders, forged through the recently concluded ProAmazonia

project (GEF ID 9055). The insights, contacts, and relationships acquired from these previous engagements will be leveraged during the PPG phase to conduct thorough consultations with NGOs, local communities, CSOs, and private sector partners. The valuable information gathered through these consultations will play a pivotal role in shaping the intervention components of the project. It is important to mention that stakeholders consulted by PROAmazonia indicated several needs, which were considered to elaborate the activities proposed in this project.

UNDP response - 15/12/2023:

Acknowledging the indispensable role of stakeholder consultation in project development, we would like to clarify that this process commenced in tandem with the closure procedures of the PROAmazonia project (GEF ID 9055) for this year. Throughout this phase, a series of meetings took place, focusing on critical areas of work and activities in the region, particularly addressing environmental challenges.

The engagements with stakeholders led to the establishment of a collaborative and trustworthy relationship. Subsequently, the GEF 8 PIF "Integrated landscape management in the Napo River Basin for sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation" was meticulously crafted, aligning with the needs identified through these discussions.

Additionally, a meeting was conducted by UNDP on December 14th, engaging stakeholders from NGOs, the private sector (including banks), indigenous communities, and local governments. The purpose of this meeting was to present and validate the project's objectives, components, activities, and budget of the GEF 8. Please see the revised PIF for the list of names and dates of all the meetings held with local and national stakeholders.

## 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

**October 30, 2023:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments  
**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments  
**October 30, 2023:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments  
**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments  
**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments  
**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments  
**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

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

**October 30, 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

**October 30, 2023:**

1. Please replace ?recurrent expenditures? to ?investment mobilized for ?other government institutions?.

Recipient Country Government	Other governmental institutions	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	3,527,147.00
------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------	------------------------	--------------

2. Please replace ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures? for water funds and indigenous organizations.

Others	Water Funds	In-kind	Investment mobilized	605,429.00
Beneficiaries	Indigenous Organizations	In-kind	Investment mobilized	135,840.00

**November 30, 2023:**

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

1. Thanks for the comment. Please note that following additional consultations with the government, the type of co-financing was changed from ?grant? to ?in-kind?. Therefore, ?recurrent expenditures? is maintained.

2. Adjusted as suggested.

#### **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

**October 30, 2023:**

Not clearly. The letter of endorsement is not signed. Please provide a signed letter of endorsement.

**November 30, 2023:**

Indeed, the electronic signature appears when using pdf acrobat reader. Cleared.

#### Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

Thanks for the comment. The new letter is digitally signed. The QR code under the signature field sometimes does not appear. Please try to open the document with several pdf readers/viewers.

Sincerely,



Mrs. Irene Schultdt Espinel  
Director of International Cooperation  
Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition of Ecuador (MAATE)

Copy to:

José Antonio Dávalos  
Minister of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition  
Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition

Karina Barrera  
Undersecretary of Climate Change  
Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition  
Convention Technical Focal Point for UNFCCC

Angel Onofa  
Biodiversity Specialist  
Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition  
Convention Technical Focal Point for UNCBD

Karina Salinas  
Climate Change Specialist  
Ministry of Environment, Water and Ecological Transition  
Convention Technical Focal Point for UNCCD

Walter Schultdt  
Director of Environmental and Sustainable Development Affairs  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Human Mobility  
Convention Political Focal Point for UNFCCC, UNCCD, UNCBD

Matilde Mordt  
Resident Representative UNDP Ecuador

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

Secretariat's Comments

**October 30, 2023:**

Yes, but the OFP endorsement letter need to be amended as mentioned above. Please remove the 2 uplodaded letters of endorsement which are not signed and ensure only the correct signed letter is uploaded to the Portal.

**November 30, 2023:**

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

Thanks for the comment. Unfortunately, the portal does not allow previously uploaded letters to be deleted. Please check the latest uploaded letter named: [PIMS 9648 Ecuador\\_Integrated\\_River\\_Basin\\_Management Updated Signed LoE.pdf](#)

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

Secretariat's Comments

**October 30, 2023:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**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 CommentsN/A

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

**October 30, 2023:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**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

**October 30, 2023:**



Yes, there is already a comprehensive ESS screening document uploaded to the GEF Portal. 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

**October 30, 2023:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

**8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

Secretariat's Comments

**October 30, 2023:**

The consideration of biodiversity is missing in the Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet while it is the main Focal Area of this project. Please complete as needed.

**November 30, 2023:**

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

Thanks for the comment. The consideration of biodiversity was included in the Annex F but for some reason it did not appear on the portal. We made sure it can be seen this time.

## 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 N/A

Agency's Comments

### 9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

**October 31, 2023:**

Not yet. Please address the comments above.

**December 7, 2023:**

Not yet. Please address the remaining comment above.

**January 18, 2024:**

Thank you for addressing the remaining comments. The PIF and PPG are recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 28/11/2023:

Thank you, all the comments have been addressed.

UNDP response - 15/12/2023:

Comments to the latest observation have been addressed.

**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**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>11/3/2023</b>	<b>11/27/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>12/7/2023</b>	<b>12/15/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>1/18/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		