



Integrating Landscape Considerations in Wildlife Conservation, with Emphasis on Jaguars

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10304

Countries

Ecuador

Project Name

Integrating Landscape Considerations in Wildlife Conservation, with Emphasis on Jaguars

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/4/2020

Review completed by PM

5/5/2021

Program Manager

Adriana Moreira

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

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

3-15-21 AM: Proposal is aligned with GEF BD focal area strategy and GWP Program Framework.

While the duration is 36 months, the Expected Completion Date is only 1 day after the Expected Implementation Start. Please amend

Submission Date	Expected Implementation Start	Expected Completion Date
12/4/2020	7/2/2021	7/3/2021

4-8-21 AM: Agency has updated correct dates.

1.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec Comments from 3-30-21 AM:

This has been corrected; the new expected completion date in the GEF portal is 07/01/2024.

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

3-15-21 AM: Project design is technically sound with consistent outcomes and outputs. However, there is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. The proposed GEF contribution to PMC is around 8.4%, hence the co-financing contribution is expected to be at similar levels. Please revise and amend. Thanks!

4-8-21 AM: Agency response is satisfactory.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec Comments from 3-15-21

The co-financing contribution to PMC has now been adjusted to represent approximately 9% of the total co-financing.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

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

3-15-21 AM: Proposed co-financing is adequate.

3-30-21 AM: There are discrepancies between several co-financing letters and table C, especially regarding the type of co-financing. Also noting that many letters mention annexes with matrix of the details but these have not been provided in the submission: Letter from FIAS indicates in-kind co-financing (not grant); letter from INABIO does not mention the type but activities refer to in-kind (annex missing); letter from WWF Ecuador does not specify the type of co-financing (annex missing); letter from IUCN does not mention the type but activities refer to in-kind; letter from Ecopar does not

specify the type of co-financing (annex missing); letter from UNDP does not specify the type of co-financing (annex missing). Please revise and amend.

Please classify co-financing from GCF as from ?donor agency? (even if the letter is issued by the government implementation unit).

4-8-21 AM: Agency response is satisfactory.

Agency Response

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec Comments from 3-30-21 AM:

We changed the type of financing for FIAS, INABIO, Ecopar and IUCN to ?in kind?. WWF co-financing has been disaggregated between ?in kind? (\$220,000) and ?grant? (\$550,000). Missing annexes (excel files) have been uploaded and these show the type and disaggregation of the cofinancing. GCF is categorized as ?donor agency?. All corrections were made in the GEF portal and the Word version of the CEO ER. Annexes were also uploaded.

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 3-15-21 AM: Yes, the proposed financing is adequate.

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 3-15-21 AM: Yes, the status of utilization of PPG is reported in Annex C.

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 3-15-21 AM: Proposed targets for core indicators are satisfactory.

Agency Response

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

3-15-21 AM: The proposal includes a consistent Theory of Change, with analysis barriers and risks.

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

3-15-21 AM: Baseline scenario analysis is satisfactory.

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

3-15-21 AM: Proposed outcomes are technically consistent with components and activities described.

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

3-15-21 AM: Description of alignment with BD Focal area strategy and GWP framework is satisfactory.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-15-21 AM: Incremental reasoning analysis is consistent and technically sound.

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

3-15-21 AM: The project provides indication of contribution to Global Environmental Benefits, such as such as improving conservation of jaguar populations and PA management.

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

3-15-21 AM: Yes, project has potential for scaling up.

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

3-15-21 AM: Maps and coordinates are satisfactory.

Agency Response

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

3-15-21 AM: This project is one of the first projects of GWP in Latin America and clearly contributes to the expansion of the program and increased impact on new species and habitats.

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

3-15-21 AM: The project has an adequate stakeholders and IP engagement plan.

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

3-15-21 AM: The project includes gender-responsive activities and gender sensitive indicators.

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

3-15-21 AM: Proposed project private sector engagement strategy is adequate and innovative.

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

3-15-21 AM: The risk analysis and proposed mitigation measures are adequate, and include climate and Covid impacts.

.

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

3-15-21 AM: Institutional arrangements are adequate with clear attribution of roles and responsibilities. Coordination with other relevant GEF projects and other initiatives is also described.

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

3-15-21: Yes, project is well aligned with national priorities.

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

3-15-21 AM: Proposed knowledge management approach is technically sound.

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

3-15-21 AM: M&E plan is satisfactory.

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

3-15-21 AM: Yes, project includes description of local benefits and GEBs.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-15-21 AM: Annexes are adequate. The audit checklist is satisfactory.

3-30-21AM: Budget in Portal has formatting problems so it is not possible to understand which source is paying which expenditures. Please, revise formatting and resubmit.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)						Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)[1]
		Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		
		Sub-component 1.1	Sub-component 2.1	Sub-component 3.1					
Goods	72300 Materials & Goods Insurance for wildlife monitoring equipment (equipment provided by MAE, project will cover insurance; \$34/camera trap year 1, \$35/camera trap year 2 and \$36/camera trap year 3; 100 camera traps = \$10,500 total)	10,500			10,500			10,500	WCS
Goods	72300 Materials & Goods Research equipment for wildlife traffic control agencies to improve research, data management and prosecution (part of Output 3.2; = \$30,211 total (\$9,775 year 1 + \$10,067 year 2 + \$10,369 year 3))				30,211			30,211	WCS
Goods	72800 Information Technology Equipment IT equipment for wildlife traffic control agencies to improve research, data management and prosecution; part of Output 3.2 = \$11,356 total (\$5,594 year 2 + \$5,762 year 3)				11,356			11,356	WCS

The only budget line that seems to be clear (to be confirmed by the time of resubmission) is that related with some people (Finance Manager, Accountant, Financial Assistant) charged to the PMC for a total amount of \$119,520 (see screenshot below). However in page of the ProDoc, the personnel that is part of the PMU are the Project Manager, the Administrative Assistant and the Technical Assistant. Please clarify this discrepancy.

Contractual Services – Individual	71400 Contractual Services – Individual Finance Manager, 45% of this person's time and associated salary will be charged to this project = \$50,571 total (\$1,404.75/month * 36 months). Accountant, 62% of this person's time and associated salary will be charged to this project = \$44,262 total (\$1,229.50/month * 36 months). Financial assistant, 56% of this person's time and associated salary will be charged to this project = \$24,687 total (\$685.75/month * 36 months).						119,520
-----------------------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	---------

82. WCS is in charge of project management through a Program Management Unit, to be established in Quito. The PMU will consist of a Project Manager, an administrative assistant and a technical assistant. The PMU will be supported by different thematic experts and service providers, to support the execution of project activities, including strategic aspects such as gender mainstreaming, stakeholder inclusion, communication and monitoring and evaluation. Part of these experts will be WCS staff, others will be hired through (short term and longer term)

4-13-21: Thanks for the response, we still have the following observations regarding the Budget:

1. Please eliminate the budget line "Miscellaneous" as this is not meant to be covered by the GEF portion of the PMC *or* to charge this to the co-financing portion of the PMC.
2. Project staff (Finance Manager ? Accountant ? Financial Assistant) is partially charged to the project's components. However, these positions are part of the execution of the project, reason why these expenses must be charged to the Project Management Costs (PMC) of both "the GEF portion and the co-financing portion" (see Guidelines paragraph 5 ? page 49) ? please amend.
3. Training, Workshops and Confer Inception workshop, including validation of workplan, livelihoods plan ? this is being charged to the PMC ? it seems to be more related with either M&E or the Project Components. Please allocate this cost to the appropriate source.

4-28-21: Thanks for the responses, there is still one comment was not addressed:

"Miscellaneous" has to be eliminated *or* charged to the co-financing portion of the PMC ? now Miscellaneous is charged to the Project component 3. As mentioned in the previous comments dated April 13, please either eliminate or charge it to the co-financing portion of the PMC.

5-7-21: Please note that while there are items in "Miscellaneous" that seem to be reasonable (banking costs, insurance), there are others that are too unspecific (contracting costs, unforeseen) and cannot be funded with GEF funds. The request is eliminate the to eliminate the unspecified costs and provide a justification for the proposed budget lines. The project has substantial co-financing which ideally should cover these type of costs. Thanks.

Agency Response

Response to GEF Sec comments from 5-7-21

The miscellaneous costs in all components have been reduced significantly to cover only banking and insurance costs related to the spending in those specific components, based on an analysis of the number of transactions and activities in each. Unspecified costs, such as contracting costs and unforeseen, have been removed from the miscellaneous lines. This GEF funding has been shifted to other budgetary lines, such as supplies, and contractual services- implementing partner, which now includes the contracting costs.

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec Comments from 4-28-21:

As requested, the Miscellaneous budget line and amount have been eliminated from Component 3. Aside from this adjustment, budget line 72400 Communic & Audio Visual Equip has been incorporated under Component 4, responding to the demands of the current context related to communication platforms.

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec Comments from 4-13-21

As requested, the Miscellaneous budget line has been eliminated from the GEF portion of the PMC and this amount has been added to the Miscellaneous costs under Outcome 3.

The Finance Manager, Accountant and Financial Assistant have actually not been charged in any part to the project's components. These positions are only partially charged to PMC because they are part-time positions (only part of their time will be dedicated to the Ecuador jaguars project) to maximize cost-effectiveness.

Finally, the training, workshops and conference inception workshop is no longer being charged to PMC and this cost has been added to the same budget line in Outcome 4.

As a result of these changes, the final two budget notes (budget notes 29 and 30) have been removed.

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec Comments from 3-30-21 AM:

For the project management, the PMU will be supported by a (part time) Finance Manager, Accountant and Financial Assistant. This has been clarified in the description in the ProDoc (paragraphs 82) and in the project organization structure figure after paragraph 83.

In addition, although from our side we were able to see the previous budget without any formatting issues, we have uploaded the file again. In case there are still formatting difficulties from your end, we have also uploaded it as a single annex to the attachments section of the GEF portal.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3-15-21 AM: Project results framework is technically sound and consistent with project objectives and proposed activities.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-15-21 AM: Please, revise minor comments above and re-submit. Thanks!

4-8-21 AM: Agency response is technically adequate.

4-13-21: Please revise minor comments regarding the budget above and re-submit.
Thanks!

4-28-21: Thanks for the responses. Please there is still one minor comment that needs to be addressed in the budget.

- 5- 5-7-21: Please address the budget related comment above. Given the incoming June 12, 2021 you might want to consider requesting an extension to finalize the processing for this project. Thanks!

Agency Response

Agency response to GEF Sec comment 5-7-21

The above comment related to the miscellaneous costs in the budget has been addressed. In addition, given the upcoming June 12th deadline for CEO approval, UNDP submitted a letter from the GEF operational focal point to the GEF requesting an extension due to force majeure on May 24th, 2021 and we are awaiting a response.

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec Comments from 4-28-21:

Above comment related to budget. has been addressed.

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec Comments from 4-13-21

Above comment related to budget has been addressed.

UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec Comments from 3-15-21

Above comment related to co-financing has been adjusted.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3-15-21 AM: Status of PPG utilization reported in Annex C.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3-15-21 AM: Project maps and coordinates are satisfactory.

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

N/A

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 N/A

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 N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please resubmit and include the Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this project. Thanks!

3-15-21 AM: Please address minor comments above and resubmit. Thanks!

3-30-21 AM: Project is technically cleared. Please, address comments on co-financing and budget above and resubmit. Thanks.

4-13-21 : Project is technically adequate. Please address remaining comments on budget above and re-submit. Thanks!

6-9-21: The request for extension of the CEO Endorsement deadline has been approved. Please respond to the May 7, 2021 request on the minor budget issue and re-submit for review. Thanks!

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations