



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9282		
Country/Region:	Ecuador		
Project Title:	Safeguarding Biodiversity in the Galapagos Islands by Enhancing Biosecurity and Creating the Enabling Environment for the Restoration of Galapagos Island Ecosystems.		
GEF Agency:	CI	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$120,000	Project Grant:	\$3,301,472
Co-financing:	\$18,625,000	Total Project Cost:	\$21,926,472
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Miguel Morales

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>August 21, 2015</p> <p>The project meets the BD Strategy but not the LD Strategy. The land degradation strategy is focused on productive landscapes (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes) and not PA lands. As it currently stands, the project does not directly address the management of agricultural lands through this project.</p>	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Therefore, the project cannot include results in table F on SLM.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat suggest to either use the "Marginal Flexibility" option (i.e. move up to \$2 million from the LD or CC Strategy to the BD Strategy), or only use the BD funds for this project.</p> <p>September 16, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>August 21, 2015</p> <p>Yes. This project is consistent with Ecuador's national strategies.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>August 21, 2015</p> <p>NOTE: The PIF is very well documented and appears to be well anchored within the "Galapagos Biosecurity Agency Strategic Plan" 2015. That should increase the cost-effectiveness of the proposed GEF investments.</p> <p>Title The title of the project may benefit from starting in: "Improving</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>biosecurity....". The PIF is really about IAS, and only indirectly to ecosystem services. Perhaps: "Safeguarding biodiversity by improving....".</p> <p>Drivers Yes. This project has a significant focus on establishing biosecurity measures to reduce and control the introduction of IAS to the Galapagos Islands. IAS are one of the principle drivers of the loss of the endemic biodiversity of the Galapagos.</p> <p>Sustainability This project does not sufficiently address the question of sustainable financing for the activities described in the project. While some are likely one-time investments, such as eradication, other investments such as equipment, training, monitoring, inspection, and community engagement will require on-going investment past the life of the project. It is unclear if there will be sufficient resources to continue this work at needed levels. The PIF mentions a trust fund briefly, but provides no details as to whether it will be able to support this work in the future. Please elaborate on the plans of the Government's Agencies (i.e. GNPD</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>and GBA), to sustain the efforts initialized by this project, with special emphasis on maintenance of equipment and training as appropriate.</p> <p>Scaling This project will provide learning about implementing strong biosecurity measures for islands with significant traffic and cargo. The strategies for eradication and community engagement could be applied to other islands around the world.</p> <p>Innovation This project will support one of the strongest biosecurity programs in the world, particularly in a developing country.</p> <p>September 16, 2015</p> <p>Satisfactory adjustments provided.</p> <p>March 6, 2017</p> <p>The project design was altered to respond to reduced budget. The re-design is satisfactory.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>August 21, 2015</p> <p>BASELINE AND INCREMENTAL</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>REASONING</p> <p>The Baseline for the project is presented according to the "Puzzle Pieces": 1) Prevention - keeping IAS out, 2) Eradication - eliminate established IAS (p.29), 3) Control - prevent further spread and impact of IAS (p.36) and 4) Restoration - Species and ecosystems to recover (p.37).</p> <p>Since the Incremental Reasoning is developed by comparing the Baseline with the proposed components [1) Biosecurity and Pathway Management, 2) Eradicating IAS, and 3) Knowledge Management], it is probably better to remove the "Puzzle Pieces" 3) and 4) as they are not directly related to the components.</p> <p>For instance, in the proposed interventions, there is no reference to activities on Control or Restoration (Disclaimer made on paragraph 50, p.36). Relationships with Control and Re-Introduction can be made briefly in the text. By the way, better to refer to "Re-introduction of species" because "Restoration" has implications under the SFM Strategy that have no relation with this project. May be the subject of confusion.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>What is the relationship between Barriers on Table 3 (p.16-18) and those described on paragraphs 36-55? Is Table 3 necessary? The title of "Examples of barriers..." suggest that the table include a wider set of barriers that those addressed by the project.</p> <p>Once a better alignment is obtained, elaborate on the Incremental Reasoning.</p> <p>BASELINE AND CO-FINANCING</p> <p>Please ensure that "Baseline" investments are separated (to the extent possible) with "Co-financing". Strictly speaking Baseline are the projects that will take place whether or not the GEF project gets approved. It is on the "shoulders" of these investments that the GEF funding is provided on the principle of Incremental Reasoning. The co-financing are the investments that are leveraged by the project to make possible the delivery of the proposed outputs and outcomes. Co-financing projects should be listed in Table C. Baseline projects under 2.2 (p.37-42). Suggest remove paragraphs 65, 76,87.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>In this regard, see paragraph 57 (p. 38) "The total financial investment (including co-financing) to support the work proposed herein is currently estimated at US\$ 67,980,000 over the project period..."</p> <p>September 16, 2015</p> <p>Satisfactory adjustments provided.</p> <p>March 6, 2017</p> <p>The project design was altered to respond to reduced budget and revised text describing incremental costs is satisfactory.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>August 21, 2015</p> <p>OBJECTIVE</p> <p>The title is misleading as there are no interventions to "...recover populations of threaten species....". Remove reference to "recovery" and concentrate on the two main components correctly identified in the current title.</p> <p>The project does not appear to have significant activities to result in the land degradation benefits listed in Table F. See comment under item I.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>COMPONENT 1</p> <p>Target: Where does the 8,089 target of interceptions come from? How can the project predict with such accuracy the increase of interceptions?</p> <p>Can a "state of the art biosecurity system" be put in place with "detection devises", "an interception database", "hand-held data entry devices", "training" and "collection and analysis of data"? Are these the only pieces missing?</p> <p>COMPONENT 2.</p> <p>This component requires significant Investment (INV) not just Technical Assistance (TA) as presented in the type of financing. Please re-consider. How is the project going to carry-out terrestrial and marine eradications with TA only?</p> <p>It is difficult to believe that the proposed outcome can be achieved with a number of "soft" activities related to the proposed outputs like "Surveys", "Probability Statistics...", "Data collection....", and a "Report". By the way, these outcomes do not cost GEF \$6 million. The core activities of eradication are missing</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>altogether.</p> <p>Output 2.1.3. Isn't the presence of rodents and feral cats already established in Floreana? What is this output for?</p> <p>COMPONENT 3</p> <p>The "distribution" of the results of the project is not an outcome. It is an output. Please reconsider the outcome. Could the project use some of the lessons learnt to modify the management plans and other instruments as the project moves forward? More in line with "adaptive management" than on waiting for results to be published the next "Best Practice Guidelines..."? Think of options of using the data and information that is being gathered as the tools for management and adaptation.</p> <p>OTHER MATTERS NOT RELATED TO TABLE B</p> <p>Table F. Is it fair to say that the project will impact the entire land and marine area of the Galapagos within the next 36 months? Suggest reporting the area of Floreana only. What are the 17,253 ha?</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Table C: Is the co-financing of GNPD (\$26M) and GBA(\$20M) really in-kind (i.e. salaries, offices)? The 2 components need INV. There is a big disconnect here.</p> <p>TABLES TO ANNEXES</p> <p>Tables to Annexes: The reading of the PIFs is made difficult by the inclusion of so many tables, that although relevant do not need to be in the body of the text. The GEF suggest converting the following Tables into Annexes: Table 2 (or include numbers in a paragraph), Box 1, Table 4 (keep in the body of the text a table with the 4 priorities to be tackled by this project), Table 5, Table 6, Table 7 (turn into short paragraph. May want to include ref, to the total of \$7 million), Table 8 (List the projects name and \$ figure of the project, under the corresponding Baseline or Component), Table 10, Table 13, Table 14,</p> <p>On Table 15, keep Target 9 and 12. Delete the rest (not really aligned with the core activities of the project).</p> <p>Eliminate Table 9.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>September 16, 2015</p> <p>Satisfactory adjustments provided.</p> <p>March 6, 2017</p> <p>The project design was altered to respond to reduced budget. The re-design is satisfactory.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>August 21, 2015</p> <p>Yes. During PPG it is important to consider both minimization of negative impacts, but importantly the positive development impacts that will result especially beyond the small population of Floreana Island.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	<p>August 21, 2015</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	<p>August 21, 2015</p> <p>Yes, though we suggest reconsidering the use of LD funds.</p> <p>September 16, 2015</p> <p>Satisfactory adjustments provided, only funded through BD now.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Recommendations	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>August 21, 2015</p> <p>No, this project is not being recommended for clearance at this time. Please resubmit after addressing the comments under 1,3,4, and 5.</p> <p>September 16, 2015</p> <p>The revised PIF and OFP endorsement letter have satisfactorily responded to all previous concerns raised. Please note that while appreciate the rich detail and comprehensiveness found in this 80-page PIF, we request CI to reduce the overall length of future PIFs while maintaining logical rigor and scientific robustness.</p> <p>July 26, 2016</p> <p>Final issue regarding cofinancing has been resolved.</p> <p>The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p> <p>March 6, 2017</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		The project design was altered to respond to reduced budget. The re-design is satisfactory. The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review	August 23, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 26, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 06, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		