



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4777		
Country/Region:	Ecuador		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming of the Use and Conservation of Agrobiodiversity in Public Policies through Integrated Strategies and In situ Implementation in three Provinces in the Andean Highlands.		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; BD-2; BD-4; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,250,000
Co-financing:	\$4,980,000	Total Project Cost:	\$6,230,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	December 12, 2011 Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	December 12, 2011 Yes in a letter dated November 25, 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	December 12, 2011 Yes, this project is clearly in FAO's comparative advantage however the justification is poorly presented. Please focus the justification on FAO's capacity in agriculture and agrobiodiversity	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>conservation, the substance of the ITPGRFA, and access and benefit sharing.</p> <p>January 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?</p>	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<p>5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?</p>	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>Please clarify whether the Lead Technical Officer from FAO is based in the Ecuador office. As presented, country office capacity seems mainly administrative and this is a very technically demanding project that involves agrobiodiversity conservation and access and benefit sharing. Please clarify.</p> <p>January 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
Resource Availability	<p>6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>NA.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	December 12, 2011 NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	December 12, 2011 NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	December 12, 2011 Yes.	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	December 12, 2011 Yes, strongly aligned with BD 2 and BD 4 outputs and outcomes.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	December 12, 2011 Yes. Please clarify how this project fits under BD-4 and describe in the text the existing ABS framework in the country. January 17, 2012 Adequate revision provided.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	December 12, 2011 Yes. Well aligned with the NBSAP and the National Development Plan.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	December 12, 2011 Yes, this is addressed primarily through the project's plan to involve farmers, community organizations and the like in project implementation. However, please clarify how the ex-situ gene bank will be sustained post-project	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>given that it appears that the project is seeking to address long-standing shortcomings of the gene bank. In addition, please clarify if Government finance will be supporting its management going forward.</p> <p>January 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision and explanation provided.</p>	
Project Design	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>The description of the baseline situation and project is unclear with regards to the project components and the specific geographical areas where the project will invest. We note past investment by Heifer Ecuador, but the support by the Government or other donors in agrobiodiversity management in the physical and thematic areas of investment by the GEF project is not clearly presented. Please revise.</p> <p>January 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>A great many of the outputs and outcomes per component will be generating primarily local and national benefits, yet the GEF is paying for a significant portion of each component. Thus, the incremental reasoning justification for this project is not balanced or well developed and the argumentation about the global benefits the project will provide is not robust.</p> <p>A careful reading of the project results framework seems to indicate that for an investment of almost \$3 million, only 2,000 hectares of agricultural land will be managed in a way to enhance agrobiodiversity conservation. This is \$1,500 per hectare of which the GEF is paying about 50%. Even if we include within that the 15 new (but not identified) collections that will be part of the ex-situ seed bank the project is both expensive overall and with limited amount of global biodiversity benefits. Please revise.</p> <p>January 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>The project results framework is sound and clear, however, it describes a project on sustainable agriculture, with a weak description of biodiversity outcomes.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>This is then supported by text in the PIF that does not sufficiently describe the global biodiversity benefits that the project will generate. Please revise.</p> <p>January 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>Please see comments above to question 13 and 14. This aspect of the PIF must be revised as the incremental benefits seem negligible.</p> <p>January 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>A detailed and thorough description is provided on the entire aspect of socio-economic benefits and the gender dimension.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>Yes. Organizations are identified and their participation and role in the project clearly explained and justified.</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>Acceptable presentation of risks, however, please include a rating of the risks (high, medium and low). In addition, please discuss more clearly how the project will seek to enhance</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>agroecosystem resilience as part of the project design (what will be the procedure employed and how will this be supported during implementation).</p> <p>January 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>Adequate presentation of the existing initiatives, however, please explain how the project will coordinate and work with the GEF Chimborazo project.</p> <p>January 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>Adequate at PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>		
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>Project management costs exceed 10%, please reduce.</p> <p>January 17, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>The funding appears adequate, albeit expensive as noted elsewhere in this review, per the measurable outputs and outcomes of the project,</p> <p>January 17, 2012</p> <p>Explanation to question 13 noted.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>The cofinancing ratio is quite weak overall, particularly for a project that will generate so many local benefits and limited global benefits. Please improve the cofinancing ratio.</p> <p>In Table C, please include a row for each type of cofinance per source, do not simply indicate 50% cash and 50% in-kind. Thank you.</p> <p>January 17, 2012</p> <p>Table C is still not clear with regards to the INIAP. Please enter one row for each type of cofinance as requested.</p> <p>In addition, please increase the level of overall cofinance and enhance the cofinance ratio.</p>	
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>December 12, 2011</p> <p>Given FAO's strong engagement in the agriculture sector in the country, we would expect stronger levels of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		cofinance. Please enhance. January 17, 2012 Although the level of FAO cofinance has doubled, the overall cofinance ratio is quite weak and needs increased.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	December 12, 2011 Respond as appropriate.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 	December 12, 2011 NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 	December 12, 2011 NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	December 12, 2011 No. Numerous issues have been raised. Please revise and resubmit. January 17, 2012	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		No Please correct Table C and improve the cofinance ratio as noted above. March 6, 2012 All issued have been addressed. PIF is being recommended for clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 13, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 17, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 06, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat	3. Is PPG approval being	

Recommendation	recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.