

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 PIF 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

9/10/2021

Review completed by PM

10/14/2021

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

Indicative project/program description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/6/2021

Many sources of co-financing have been categorized as Public Investment ? Recurrent expenditures. Usually recurrent expenditures are be categorized as ?in-kind? as opposed to ?Public Investment?.

Since at this point no information can be used to verify whether or not ?public investment? is the correct ?type of co-financing?, please double check and verify that each source of co-financing has been adequately categorized.

10/14/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/21

Comment addressed. Co-financing was checked and table adjusted accordingly as well as INvestment mobilized explanation and sources of funds.

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

NA.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
9/21/2021

NA.

Agency Response
9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
9/21/2021

NA.

Agency Response
9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
9/21/2021

NA.

Agency Response
9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

Project/Program taxonomy

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

Part II ? Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

N/A

11/10/2021

N/A

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Given the nature of the project, it is imperative that the PIF include an analysis of climate change risks and the mitigation strategies posed to manage this risk.

10/4/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

9/28/2021

Comment addressed. A Climate Change risk was included in risk section, according with the preliminary CC screening for this project, and attached as annex D and attached to ESS risk screening. CC risk is moderate in this case, considering that national and local capacities for both technicians and inhabitants in the intervention zones. During PPG phase, should be ensure, and during project implementation, translated into adaptation climate change measures based on the context of wild relatives and edible species ecosystems to improve the management of vulnerability and risks, and also for building resilience condition, to climate change with project?s activities.

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
11/10/2021

N/A

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
11/10/2021

N/A

Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

11/10/2021

N/A

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

11/10/2021

N/A

Part III ? Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/6/2021

LOE is included. Cleared.

Please note that under "Project Information" under Other Executing Partner shows "National Autonomous Institute of Agricultural Research (INIAP)" however the LoE does not include this institution.

Two options are available:

1) Remove "INIAP" and leave it to be determined (this can be modified by the time of CEO Endorsement); OR

2) A new LoE can be presented including National Autonomous Institute of Agricultural Research (INIAP) as the Executing Agency.

10/14/2021

Cleared.

Please make one of these revisions and resubmit.

Agency Response

11/10/2021

Comment addressed. According to the suggestion, we remove INIAM and leave it as "to be determined" during PPG stage.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021

NA.

Agency Response

11/10/2021

N/A

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
9/21/2021

No. Please revise and resubmit in response to observations above.

10/6/2021

No. Please make the revisions requested above and repeated below and resubmit.

Please address the issue on cofinancing referenced above.

Also please note that under "Project Information" under Other Executing Partner shows ?National Autonomous Institute of Agricultural Research (INIAP)? ? however the LoE does not include this institution.

Two options are available:

1) Remove "INIAP" and leave it "to be determined" (this can be modified by the time of CEO Endorsement); OR

2) A new LoE can be presented including National Autonomous Institute of Agricultural Research (INIAP) as the Executing Agency.

10/14/2021

All issues have been addressed.

PIF is recommended for CEO clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	9/21/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/6/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/14/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The project aims to strengthen the conservation and sustainable use of globally important crop wild relatives (CWR) and edible wild species (EWS) in Ecuador. In order to advance the sustainable management of CWR and EWS, the project will: i) strengthen the institutional framework for the generation and/or updating of laws and regulations that regularize and facilitate conservation, sustainable use and exploitation of CWR and EWS, with procedures that can be managed by the producers themselves, and their organizations or enterprises, with the permanent support and support of the entities in charge of monitoring their compliance; ii) establish participatory methodologies and instruments for the definition and recognition of sites or areas of conservation of CWR and EWS, both in protected areas and in other important sites; procedures that will be validated in pilot management areas, for their subsequent promotion or expansion in Ecuador, both in the short and medium term.; iii) strengthen the capacities of the entities in charge of the management of CWR and EWS, through training processes, exchange of experiences and integration in local, national and regional management platforms; and iv) develop measures and systems / protocols to monitor the practices of conservation, use and sustainable utilization of priority CWRs and EWSs, based on the experiences and initiatives of local enterprises that have developed value chains for agrobiodiversity products, in order to boost the local bioeconomy and contribute to improving the quality of life of the local population.

The project includes adequate COVID-19 risk mitigation procedures.