

Conservation and sustainable use of crop wild relatives (CWR) and edible wild species (EWS), under an institutional framework and the development of rural community initiatives in Ecuador

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10855

Countries

Ecuador

Project Name

Conservation and sustainable use of crop wild relatives (CWR) and edible wild species (EWS), under an institutional framework and the development of rural community initiatives in Ecuador

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

9/30/2022

Review completed by PM

10/12/2022

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

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

10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/12/2022

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

10/12/2022

NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/12/2022

Please classify the GIZ-Biovalor cofinancing. It is not clear from the letter if the cofinance is a grant or in-kind. Please also change the source to ?Donor Agency?.

For the cofinancing from IKIAM please classify as in-kind given that you have noted it is for recurrent expenditures, currently it is labeled as "other".

On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 9.9%, for a co-financing of \$5,836,928 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$577,855 instead of \$200,000, which is 3.4%. As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased

and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion

1/4/2023

Cleared.

Agency Response

12/19/2022

1. Noted. The GIZ co-financing as been classified as in-kind and the sources as Donor Agency.
2. Thank you, the co-financing from IKIAM has been updated accordingly.
3. Thank you for the comment. A revision has been made of the co-financing contributions and in the case of the Ministry of Environmental, Water and Ecological Transition, the entity has identified that a portion of the contribution corresponds to support for the management of the project, as expressed in the table below. The co-financing in Table B of the CEO endorsement request has been updated to reflect this. The contribution of the co-financing to PMC now is in the order of 12.73%.

Updated co-financing as reported by MAATE

Component	USD Amount	Type of Co-financing
Component 1	526,807.93	In-kind
Component 2	520,047.10	In-kind
Component 3	21,607.93	In-kind
PMC	481,565.49	In-kind
Total	1,550,028.45	In-kind

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
10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

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

10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

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
10/12/2022

NA

Agency Response
Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

Gender analysis and design response is adequate. Cleared.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Benefits

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

NA

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/12/2022

NA

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/12/2022

NA

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/12/2022

NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/12/2022

NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/12/2022

NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/12/2022

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
10/12/2022

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
10/12/2022

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

10/12/2022

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/12/2022

No. Please revise per instructions above and resubmit. Required revisions are repeated here:

1. The elapsed time from start to completion is 37 months instead of 36 ? please adjust either the duration or the start/completion date.
2. On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 9.9%, for a co-financing of \$5,836,928 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$577,855 instead of \$200,000, which is 3.4%. As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion
3. Please classify the GIZ-Biovalor cofinancing. It is not clear from the letter if the cofinance is a grant or in-kind. Please also change the source to ?Donor Agency?. For the cofinancing from IKIAM please classify as in-kind given that you have noted it is for recurrent expenditures, currently it is labeled as "other".

1/4/2023

Yes, CEO approval is recommended.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	10/12/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/4/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations