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

GEF ID:	**5534**		
Country/Region:	**Ecuador**		
Project Title:	**Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Diversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5314 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-1; BD-4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$91,324**	Project Grant:	**$2,726,908**
Co-financing:	**$11,546,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$14,364,232**
PIF Approval:	**September 12, 2013**	Council Approval/Expected:	**November 01, 2013**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Helen Coles de Negret**

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**?	8-21-13 Yes. Ecuador is eligible for funding. Cleared	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	8-21-13 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for $3.8M dated August 8th, 2013 Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	8-21-13 No. The balance for BD is $3,085,964. This resulted from overutilization of LD and CC STAR Resources (Ecuador can reallocate up to $1M among the Focal	

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Area Budgets). If Ecuador wants to pursue this project, the budget needs to be readjusted to $3,085,964 or below. As there are other projects coming from Ecuador, these funds are on a first-come-first served bases. 8-28-13 Issues properly addressed in the Responses to GEF Comments and Revised PIF submitted 8-27-13 Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	8-21-13 No. The balance for BD is $3,085,964. This resulted from overutilization of LD and CC STAR Resources (Ecuador can reallocate up to $1M among the Focal Area Budgets). If Ecuador wants to pursue this project, the budget needs to be readjusted to $3,085,964 or below. As there are other projects coming from Ecuador, these funds are on a first-come-first served bases. 8-28-13 Issues properly addressed in the Responses to GEF Comments and Revised PIF submitted 8-27-13 Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).*	8-21-13 Yes. BD1 and BD-4. Aichi Targets 12, 16 and 20. Cleared	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	8-21-13 There is reference to the National Plan for Good Living in support of ABS activities. Cleared	
Project Design	6. 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?	8-21-13 The baseline program for bio-prospecting research appears very weak. Who has paid attention to the antimicrobial, antifungal, anti-parasitic and antiviral properties of peptids obtained from the frogs? If there are so many properties, and the Component 2 is aiming at delivering 4 lead compounds characterized, one protein synthesized and pharmacologically tested, who are all the interested parties? There is also reference to SENESCYT reporting of over 20 multinational companies interested in setting up labs in the Yachay. Is this really a project for non-commercial use? If this is more than scientific research, the activities to be in compliance with the NP to make this a pilot on ABS Agreements work, need to	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		be reinforced. 8-28-13 Issues properly addressed in the Responses to GEF Comments and Revised PIF submitted 8-27-13 Cleared	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	8-21-13 The structure of the project requires reorganization. Component 1. Only output 1.3 is in line with the objective of the component (i.e. the survival of the species). Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 are parts of the scientific processes and should go under Component 2. For output 1.3. please elaborate on the feasibility and efficiency of establishing Municipal reserves. Do all target species reside outside the network of National Protected Areas? Do not these PAs require additional resources for effective management and protection of the frog species? Are activities under output 1.1, like cryopreservation, Ex-situ "conservation strategies"? Move this to Component 2. Component 2. Output 2.1 belongs to Component 3. What are the Ecuadorian Labs to benefit from tech transfer (output 2.3)?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		For clarification, the GEF cannot support graduate studies (i.e. MS or PhDs). Component 3. Should go above component 2 so the relationship of the scientific work and pilot ABS agreement for non-commercial research is properly framed. This component is very weak on the activities that Ecuador needs to undertake to Ratify and Implement the basic measures of the Nagoya Protocol. The project would benefit from beefing-up that part (see also comment under baseline). It is also necessary to elaborate on the existing policy, legal and regulatory framework on which the work with Queen's University in Belfast will be standing. This is important to avoid liabilities of the parties involved, including UNDP and the GEF. This is particularly important based on the fact that the habitats of these frogs occur within the territories of indigenous peoples (see risks). 8-28-13 Issues properly addressed in the Responses to GEF Comments and Revised PIF submitted 8-27-13 Cleared	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	8-21-13 The GEBs of this project will be enhanced by including the National Protected Areas where these species occur. Not clear why so much emphasis	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		on private and municipal reserves. Are these frogs restricted to these areas? How many and what is the size of these private and municipal reserve to increase the national percentage of areas under conservation from 19.4% to 25%? Is this correct? 8-28-13 Issues properly addressed in the Responses to GEF Comments and Revised PIF submitted 8-27-13 Cleared	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	8-31-13 Included in the project execution. Cleared	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	8-21-13 Although the chytrid fungus is mentioned in the text, it is not presented as a risk factor. Why? Are the target species and their habitats not vulnerable to the disease? Are there any measures to mitigate the disease anyway?	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	8-21-13 Please elaborate on what progress has Ecuador on ratification and implementation of the NP thanks to the regional project "Strengthening the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Implementation of Access to Genetic Resources". 8-28-13 Issues properly addressed in the Responses to GEF Comments and Revised PIF submitted 8-27-13 Cleared	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	8-21-13 The development of the Ecuadorian Amphibian Life Bank will be a novel strategy in the field of biodiversity conservation and will add to the current experience of ex-situ conservation. The linkages between key national stakeholders such as the MAE and SENESCYT will surpass the duration of this project affording sustainability of efforts and projecting increased strengthening of capacities in the future. Cleared	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to	8-21-13 Yes. Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
Project Financing	17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	8-21-13 Yes. There is co-funding from the Government (The Ministry of Environment and the National Secretariat of Science and Technology), the Private Sector (Queen's University), NGO (Centro Jambatu) and the GEF Agency. Cleared	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	8-21-13 Yes. It is 4.7%. Cleared	
	19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	8-21-13 Yes. PPG request is for $91K and is within the limits. Cleared	
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	8-21-13 No. Please address outstanding issues under 3,6,7,11, and 12. 8-28-13 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
	First review*	August 21, 2013	
Review Date (s)	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.**