



# GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT  
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Sustainable Development of the Ecuadorian Amazon: integrated management of multiple use landscapes and high value conservation forests			
Country:	Ecuador	GEF Project ID:	9055
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5606
Other Executing Partners:	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Aquaculture and Fisheries (MAGAP) and Ministry of Environment (MAE)	Submission Date:	November 14, 2016
GEF Focal Area	Multi-focal Areas	Project Duration (Months)	72
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/>	Corporate Program: SGP	<input type="checkbox"/>
Name of Parent Program	N/A	Agency Fee (\$)	1,121,630

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
BD-4 Program 9	Outcome 9.1 Increased area of production landscapes and seascapes that integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management. Outcome 9.2 Sector policies and regulatory frameworks incorporate biodiversity considerations.	GEFTF	6,952,220	26,295,725
LD3-Program 4	Outcome 3.1: Support mechanisms for SLM in wider landscapes established <input type="checkbox"/> Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities based on gender sensitive needs . <input type="checkbox"/>	GEFTF	1,356,147	6,596,513
SFM-1	Outcome 1: Cross-sector policy and planning approaches at appropriate governance scales, avoid loss of high conservation value forests. Outcome 2: Innovative mechanisms avoid the loss of high conservation value forest. <input type="checkbox"/>	GEFTF	4,154,183	16,446,113
<b>Total project costs</b>			<b>12,462,550</b>	<b>49,338,351</b>

### B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

**Project Objective:** Catalyze the transformation of land use planning and management in the Ecuadorian Amazon (CTEA) by building a governance and sustainable production framework based on a landscape approach and optimizing ecosystem services and livelihoods

Project Components/ Programs	Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
1. Strengthened multi-level governance framework for sustainable management and production in	TA	Strengthened multi-level governance framework and capacities for management of multiple use landscapes (MUL) maintains the supply of ecosystem services (including conservation of biodiversity,	1.1 <u>National multi-sectorial coordination and policy strengthened to support sustainable production in MULs</u> by: a) facilitating the implementation of coordination mechanisms foreseen in the Constitution, through dialogue and coordination between the Citizen Sectorial	GEFTF	3,436,444	7,661,186

<p>multiple use landscapes (MUL) and high value conservation forests (HCVF) in the Special Amazonian Territorial Circumscription (CTEA)</p>	<p>soils, water resources and carbon sequestration) in 1,859,600 hectares of MUL housing high value conservation forests (HCVF); and provides avoided carbon emissions estimated at 257,566.69 tCO<sub>2e</sub>. Indirect replication targets: 3.328.813 ha and 6.470.386 ha in the long term. 8,726,514.50 tCO<sub>2e</sub> in CTEA over 20 years<sup>1</sup></p> <p>Reduced direct pressure of productive sectors on forests: 10% reduction in historical deforestation rate for the 3 landscapes reduces evidenced by the change in forest and ecosystem fragmentation patterns and landscape structure</p> <p>New partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services at national and/or sub-national level (1 Platform for Territorial Coordination with Multiple Use Landscape (MUL) and High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF) approach; 4 Regional Platforms for Sustainable Supply Chains of coffee, cacao, livestock and palm oil; 1 Roundtable for Wood, Non-wood and Biodiversity Products) established with at least 40% membership of either sex and 60% membership from indigenous nationalities)</p> <p>Improved institutional capacities of 7 institutions for effective sustainable planning and management in MUL in a coordinated and articulated manner, as measured by a % of increase in the UNDP Capacity Scorecard over the baseline. Score rating: 0: Inefficient; 1: Good; 2: Very Good; 3 Excellent MAE: 1 increases to 3 MAGAP: 2 increases to 3 GAD Orellana : 1 increases to 3 GAD Shushufindi: 1 increases to 2 GAD Taisha: 1 increases to 2 GAD Morona : 2 increases to 3 GAD Nangaritza: 1 increases to 2</p>	<p>Councils for Production, Environment, Water, Transport and Mining and between Sectorial Councils and their respective ministries<sup>2</sup> for integrated policies; <b>b)</b> strengthening regulations on forest conservation and land use, including: developing regulations to promote the production of deforestation free products (coffee, cocoa, oil palm, livestock); manuals and guidelines and other procedural documents in project-related subjects; mainstreaming gender and inter-cultural approaches in forest regulations; and developing regulations for SFM and NTFPs.</p> <p>1.2 <u>Decentralized institutional structures strengthened for management and surveillance of sustainable production in MULs</u>. This includes: <b>a)</b> establishing a Territorial Coordination Platform (TCP) as a multi-level governance model involving national, provincial, municipal and parish levels for stakeholder coordination for land use planning; <b>b)</b> strengthening local participatory structures in three target landscapes, namely Citizen Assemblies and Planning Councils in support of coordination processes within the TCP; <b>c)</b> capacity building of local governments and regional divisions of MAE and MAGAP. This includes training programs on: i) integrated landscape approach to land use planning, and ii) GIS and national forest monitoring system to support regulation enforcement; <b>d)</b> establishment of local development agencies in municipal GADs for promotion of local economic development and livelihoods.</p> <p>1.3 <u>Land-use planning strengthened with multi-sectorial dialogue &amp; decision-making mechanisms</u>: <b>a)</b> local/provincial and national planning strengthened to mainstream a landscape approach and environmental criteria, and interlink the different government and community levels, through: <b>a-i)</b> application of UNREDD+ existing studies on deforestation and opportunity costs assessments of land-uses, and 3 Target Scenario Analyses for each sub-region (North, Center and South) for adjustment of sectorial policies and decision making on sustainable production models; <b>a-ii)</b> updating of Land Use and Development Plans (LUDP) of 5 cantons and 5 parishes incorporating specific guidelines (production systems, forest categories, land degradation level); and <b>a-iii)</b> support to</p>		
---	---	---	--	--

<sup>1</sup> CO<sub>2</sub> emissions calculations are based on the volume of wood harvested (based on permits issued by MAE) in the provinces of Morona Santiago and Zamora Chinchipe (project intervention areas for SFM) over 6 years (direct lifetime emissions) and in the six Amazon provinces over 20 years (indirect lifetime emissions). See SFM Tracking Tool for detailed explanation on calculation of direct and indirect lifetime emissions (CO<sub>2</sub> Calculation Sheet)

<sup>2</sup> Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Aquaculture and Fisheries, Ministry of Environment, Water Secretariat, Ministry of Transport and Public Works and Ministry of Mining

		<p>The Land Use and Development Plans in 5 cantons of the target landscapes mainstream landscape approach, HCVF, biodiversity and ecosystem services considerations, gender and intercultural approaches</p> <p>Increased direct participation of women and members of indigenous nationalities in planning and management of MUL/HCFV in participatory structures that operate regularly and democratically: at least 40% women and 60% members of indigenous nationalities in Citizen Assemblies, Cantonal Planning Councils and Territorial Coordination Platform</p>	<p>indigenous communities to mainstream that landscape approach in Life Plans and coordination with above LUDPs.</p> <p>1.4 <u>Local surveillance and monitoring systems</u> strengthened to support enforcement of land use plans and sustainable agriculture, livestock and forestry regulations in the CTEA: (a local participatory early warning system including capacity building of local authorities and communities, grievance mechanisms to report illegal activities, coordination with the National Forest Monitoring System and REDD+ social and environmental safeguards, and Citizen Observatories to monitor land use changes related to productive activities).</p> <p>1.5 <u>Knowledge management program</u> for sustainable production and landscape management: <b>a)</b> knowledge networks (NGO, universities and communities) to document best practices and lessons; <b>b)</b> develop a communication, education and environmental awareness strategy and learning materials; <b>c)</b> promote an information node for the Ecuadorian Amazon between public institutions and universities; <b>d)</b> linking Ecuadorian networks with the Amazon Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN).</p>			
2. Access to markets, credit and incentives for sustainable production of the main products in multiple use and high conservation value landscapes of the CTEA	TA	<p>Increase in the volume of products commercialized in the target landscapes that respond to sustainable production criteria: a) 30% increase in volume of sales from Amazonian farms that incorporate environment-friendly best practices; b) 30% increase in volume of products entering the national market that comply with best practice or ecological certifications</p> <p>Increase in volume of NTFP produced within the Socio-Bosque Program (PSB) that satisfies the demand identified by the Roundtable for Wood, Non-wood and Biodiversity Products: a) 25% increase in community and individual PSB investment plans that include NTFP production with management plans; b) 35 % increase in volume of NTFP produced under management plans and commercialized in the national market</p> <p>Five financial institutions have implemented new financial products with environmental criteria, with 25% of their loan portfolios mainstreaming</p>	<p>2.1 <u>Regional Platforms for Sustainable Supply Chains</u> of coffee, cocoa, oil palm and livestock in Northern and Southern Amazon for multi-stakeholder dialogue and consensus, reach agreements to promote deforestation free supply chains, and connect buyers of sustainable products with producers.</p> <p>2.2 <u>Regional Action Plans for Sustainable Supply Chains</u> coffee, cocoa, oil palm and livestock to access markets for deforestation free products: <b>a)</b> the coffee action plan will seek to increase productivity and supply the domestic demand; <b>b)</b> the cocoa action plan will seek to identify market niches with differentiated prices; <b>c)</b> the oil palm action plan will seek to promote certification schemes to achieve differentiated prices and increase productivity of established plantations without expanding cultivation areas; <b>d)</b> the livestock action plan will focus on sustainability of production, and quality and safety of products for the domestic market.</p> <p>2.3 <u>Market access for wood, non-wood and biodiversity products</u> in Central and Southern Amazon. This includes: <b>a)</b> the establishment of a Roundtable for Wood, Non-wood and Biodiversity Products for stakeholder dialogue, coordination and agreement; <b>b)</b> market and feasibility studies</p>	GEF TF	3,426,905	11,709,181

		<p>environmental criteria</p> <p>432,243 ha of HCVPs in community and indigenous lands (in protective forests and PSB conservation areas) conserved through incentives</p>	<p>for at least four non-wood products; <b>c)</b> developing the action plan for the roundtable; and <b>d)</b> developing a competitive grants mechanism to support identification of initiatives for sustainable production, value adding and commercialization of NTFPs to support development of supply chains.</p> <p><u>2.4 Incentives strengthened for SFM and SLM:</u> <b>a)</b> strengthening systems and capacities to optimize the access to, and distribution of Socio-Bosque (PSB) community incentives to support conservation, restoration and sustainable production in community lands and individual properties; <b>b)</b> developing NTFP management plans for PSB beneficiaries; <b>c)</b> dissemination of the recently established SFM incentive to increase access of potential beneficiaries; <b>d)</b> modeling income distribution systems for other SFM incentives and SLM incentives, including REDD+ through analyzing selected cases (eg SFM linked to harvesting plans, NTFP management plan, agricultural and livestock practices, conservation and restoration).</p> <p><u>2.5 Strengthened credit systems for deforestation free production in HCVPs</u> <b>a)</b> For commercial producers of main commodities (coffee, cocoa, palm, livestock): training programmes and technical assistance for key financial institutions (public and private) to develop deforestation free investment portfolios and improve assessment of loans for sustainable production in HCVP or degraded areas; <b>b)</b> For small producers, women and youths: financial products to support sustainable production of NTFPs and alternative products; and sustainable finance training program for beneficiaries.</p>			
3. Landscape level implementation of sustainable practices in commercial production and livelihoods systems, aligned with the conservation and restoration of HCVP	TA	<p>172,646 ha of three target landscapes covered by environment-friendly best practices following best practice manuals and guidelines, based on landscape, gender and inter-cultural approaches that contribute to establishing deforestation free supply chains</p> <p>40% reduction of land degradation in the three target landscapes through restoration with native species (18,660 ha)</p> <p>Improvement in sustainable forest and biodiversity management of the Kutuku Shaimi Protective Forest: Increase in management effectiveness score for Protective</p>	<p><u>3.1 Sustainable production and environment-friendly practices</u> in coffee, cocoa and oil palm to improve connectivity in MUL and HCVPs, and complementary livelihood options in the Northern Amazon landscape: <b>a)</b> best practice manuals and guidelines; <b>b)</b> training program for technicians of public and private institutions; <b>c)</b> training and technical assistance to coffee, cocoa and oil palm producers, including small, medium and large producers (settlers, indigenous peoples, women and youths) for sustainable production; <b>d)</b> complementary livelihood options for small producers especially women and youths (aquaculture and meliponiculture); and <b>e)</b> conservation agreements with producers to protect forest remnants in their properties (critical areas for connectivity, fragile</p>	GEF TF	4,412,291	25,617,884

	<p>Forests (tool and targets to be developed during project implementation<sup>3</sup>); and 67,808 ha managed under SFM and biodiversity criteria.</p> <p>Increased adoption of agrosilvopastoral systems in the 3 target landscapes: a) 30% increase in the number of hectares under agrosilvopastoral systems in process of being established in pasture lands or already deforested lands; b) 35% increase in the number of hectares incorporating live fences with native tree species in livestock areas</p> <p>5,164 (at least 30% women and youths and 50% members of indigenous nationalities) have improved knowledge, attitude and practices measured through surveys at beginning (baseline) and end of project.</p>	<p>ecosystems, water recharge areas and connectivity corridors)</p> <p>3.2 <u>Sustainable use of biodiversity including NTFPs in the Central Amazon landscape. sustainable forest management in the Central Amazon portion of the Kutuku Shaimi protective forest</u> and complementary livelihood options. <u>Central Amazon: a)</u> management plan for the Achuar nationality territory in Center; <b>b)</b> management plans for sustainable use of four NTFPs within the Achuar territory management plan; <b>c)</b> support to Achuar communities for sustainable NTFP management; <b>d)</b> complementary livelihoods for Achuar communities emphasizing in women and youths (sustainable tourism). <u>Southern Amazon: e)</u> SFM in Kutuku Shaimi (see 3.3 below);</p> <p>3.3 <u>Sustainable livestock production and environment-friendly practices</u> to improve connectivity and restore degraded lands in MUL and HCVFs in the Southern Amazon landscape, and sustainable forest and NTFP management in the Kutuku Shaimi Protective Forest (Southern Amazon portion). <u>Livestock producers: a)</u> best practice manuals and guidelines; <b>b)</b> training program for technicians of public and private institutions; <b>c)</b> training and technical assistance to livestock producers, including small, medium and large producers for sustainable production; <b>d)</b> conservation agreements with producers to protect forest remnants in their properties (critical areas for connectivity, fragile ecosystems, water recharge areas and connectivity corridors). <u>Kutuku Shaimi forest: a)</u> management plan for Kutuku Shaimi; <b>b)</b> training and technical assistance for comprehensive SFM management and best practices; <b>c)</b> management plans for sustainable use of four NTFPs and support to Shuar indigenous communities for sustainable NTFP management, <b>d)</b> complementary livelihoods for Shuar communities emphasizing in women and youths (sustainable tourism).</p> <p>3.4 <u>Producers-support systems for upscaling at watershed level: a)</u> training programs to strengthen extension services for sustainable production and landscape approach; <b>b)</b> training programs for communities and small, medium and large producers' associations on best practices and standards for market access; <b>c)</b> support to producers to access incentives and</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

<sup>3</sup> Protective forests are public or private areas comprising natural or cultivated vegetation, trees, shrubs or herbaceous located in sloped areas, watershed divides, or areas not apt for agricultural use. Its functions are to conserve water, soil, flora and wildlife. Limited productive activities may be undertaken in accordance with a management plan. They are not protected areas, and there is no specific tool for this category; therefore the project proposes the development of a specific METT for protective forests to be piloted in the Kutuku Shaimi protective forest.

			credits; inputs, technology and other services for production.				
4. Dissemination of Lessons-learned, monitoring & evaluation	TA	Project implemented and achieving results  One (1) mid-term review report and one (1) final evaluation report  9 publications on best practices and lessons learned covering: i) integrated management of MUL; ii) platforms for sustainable supply chains successful cases; iii) territorial coordination in the Amazon region based on a landscape approach; iv) lessons learned by the platforms for sustainable supply chains; v) case studies on sustainable production best practices based on gender and inter-cultural approaches; vi) sustainable production best practices guidelines; viii) project lessons learned	4.1 <u>Project M&amp;E System established and generating periodic reports.</u> This includes: inception workshop, annual planning workshops, monitoring of activities, outputs and outcomes, monitoring of the risk matrix and identifying potential risks and mitigation measures to reduce those unexpected risks.  4.2 <u>Mid-term Review and Final Evaluation</u>  4.3 <u>Knowledge products, best practices and lessons learned:</u> publication and dissemination of nine reports systematizing project experiences, best practices and lessons learned.	GEF TF	593,456	1,679,400	
Subtotal						11,869,096	46,667,651
Project Management Cost (PMC)					GEF TF	593,454	2,670,700
<b>Total project costs</b>						12,462,550	49,338,351

### C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of Environment (MAE)	Grants	4,212,558
		In-kind	9,645,103
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Aquaculture and Fisheries (MAGAP)	Grants	18,310,121
		In-kind	457,920
National Government	National Biodiversity Institute (INB)	In-kind	1,100,000
Municipal Government	Decentralized Autonomous Government (GAD) Morona Santiago	In-kind	93,938
Municipal Government	Decentralized Autonomous Government (GAD) Orellana	In-kind	527,800
Private Sector	African Palm Producers' Association (ANCUPA)	In-kind	336,008
Private Sector	Corporation for Sustainable Forest Management (COMAFORS)	In-kind	150,000
Private Sector	VERDE CANANDE	Grants	500,000
		In-kind	1,000,000
CSO	Nature and Culture International (NCI)	In-kind	500,000
CSO	World Wide Fund (WWF)	In-kind	2,400,000
CSO	National Working Group on Voluntary Forest Certification in Ecuador (CEFOVE)	In-kind	100,000
CSO	Office for Social and Development Research (OFIS)	Grants	600,000
Others (Academia)	IKIAM Amazonian Regional University (IKIAM)	In-kind	1,286,917
Others (Academia)	Amazonian State University (UEA)	Grants	2,111,258

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
Others (Academia)	Private Technical University of Loja (UTPL)	In-kind	1,055,629
Others	KfW Development Bank	Grants	3,950,470
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grants	400,629
		In-kind	600,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>49,338,351</b>

#### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, COUNTRY AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total (c)=a+b
UNDP	GEFTF	Ecuador	Biodiversity	(select as applicable)	6,952,220	625,700	7,577,920
UNDP	GEFTF	Ecuador	Land Degradation	(select as applicable)	1,356,147	122,053	1,478,200
UNDP	GEFTF	Ecuador	Sustainable Forest Management	(select as applicable)	4,154,183	373,877	4,528,060
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>					<b>12,462,550</b>	<b>1,121,630</b>	<b>13,584,180</b>

#### E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society	Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares	1,859,600 hectares <sup>4</sup>
2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	577,852 hectares <sup>5</sup>
4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 million tons of CO <sub>2e</sub> mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	257,566.69 tCO <sub>2e</sub> over 6 years (direct) and 8,749,801.14 tCO <sub>2e</sub> over 20 years (indirect) <sup>6</sup>

#### F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? NO

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Fund) in Annex D.

## PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

<sup>4</sup> To be measured through: Field visits, MAE, MAGAP, GAD statistics; and surveys, interviews with members of multi-stakeholder platforms (e.g. producers' associations). Please refer to Annex B Monitoring Plan of the GEF-UNDP Project Document for further details on data sources, collection methods and means of verification.

<sup>5</sup> To be measured through: MAGAP and GADs' surveys and statistics; surveys and interviews with producers' associations; MAE permits. Please refer to Annex B Monitoring Plan of the GEF-UNDP Project Document for further details on data sources, collection methods and means of verification.

<sup>6</sup> CO<sub>2</sub> emissions calculations are based on the volume of wood harvested (based on permits issued by MAE) in the provinces of Morona Santiago and Zamora Chinchipe (project intervention areas for SFM) over 6 years (direct lifetime emissions) and in the six Amazon provinces over 20 years (indirect lifetime emissions). See SFM Tracking Tool for detailed explanation on calculation of direct and indirect lifetime emissions (CO<sub>2</sub> Calculation Sheet) and Annex B Monitoring Plan of the GEF-UNDP Project Document for further details on data sources, collection methods and means of verification.

## **A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF**

### *A.1. Project Description.*

No changes to the project's objectives, intentions or scope were made since the PIF stage. The relevance and feasibility have been confirmed through additional studies and through extensive consultation processes (see Section IV Results and Partnerships, sub-section iii Stakeholder engagement of the GEF-UNDP Project Document). In addition, the three landscapes were selected in a very thorough process (please refer to Section III Strategy, footnote 16 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document). It seeks to catalyze the transformation of land use planning and management in the Ecuadorian Amazon by building a governance and sustainable production framework based on a landscape approach and optimizing ecosystem services and livelihoods. It will optimize baseline initiatives by incorporating a landscape approach that will strengthen central and decentralized capacities to achieve the sustainable development priorities stated in the national and provincial development plans. To achieve this, the project intervention strategy will have a dual approach. Firstly, systemic interventions (national and sectoral levels) addressing the central and decentralized (provinces, cantons and parishes) government levels to strengthen the institutional stakeholders for developing the governance, financial and market frameworks for sustainable production and management of multiple use landscapes and delivery of global environmental benefits (Components 1 and 2). Secondly, field interventions in three priority landscapes of high conservation value in the North, Central and South Amazon to address the main drivers of deforestation in each sub-region and deliver multiple environmental benefits and improve the livelihoods of local populations (component 3). Since the PIF stage a fourth component "Dissemination of lessons learned, monitoring and evaluation" has been added to address systematization and dissemination of lessons learned, and monitoring and evaluation separately for better management of the Monitoring and Evaluation framework and reporting purposes, and funds have been allocated to the new component, representing 5% of the total budget. Project indicators and targets have been fine tuned.

#### *1) Global environmental problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed*

No changes from PIF. Statistical data has been updated taking into account the three selected landscapes and the criteria used to select them (see Section III Strategy, footnote 16 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document on selection process). Please refer to Section II "Development Challenge", pages 7-15 of the GEF-UNDP project document.

#### *2) Baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects:*

No changes from PIF. The project document identifies a wider range of partners that will be involved in project implementation and includes the baseline initiatives that will contribute to the project's results. Kindly refer to Section IV "Results and Partnerships", sub-section ii "Partnerships", Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8 regarding partnerships with government partners, civil society, academic and private sector partners (pages 49-59) of the GEF-UNDP project document.

#### *3) Proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area strategies, with a brief description of outcomes and components of the project:*

No changes in the proposed alternative scenario and GEF focal area strategies. The PIF outcomes remain the same. Slight changes have been introduced at output level for better organization of the intervention logic: Output 2.1 has been broken down in two outputs and Output 3.1 has been broken down into three outputs. The PIF budget has been adjusted with slight changes between components and mainly to allocate resources from the original components to the new component on dissemination of lessons and monitoring and evaluation. Please refer to Section IV "Results and Partnerships" (pages 26-49) of the GEF-UNDP project document for a detailed description of the implementation of outputs.

#### *4) Incremental cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF and cofinancing:*

No changes from PIF. Baseline projects as well as other contributions to the project's baseline and co-financing are presented in detail in Section III "Results and Partnerships", Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8 (49-59) and Section VIII "Financial Planning and Management", Table 14 "Parallel Co-financing" (pages 94-96) of the GEF-UNDP Project document.

The total amount of co-financing committed in the PIF remains the same. A greater number of co-financiers has been identified and the contributions have been fine-tuned. As can be deduced from Table 14 “Parallel Co-financing” significant investments will be made by the key relevant institutions in the three areas covered by the project (governance, market and incentives, and landscape level implementation of sustainable practices). These investments will mainly be allocated to: costs of staff assigned to project activities; monetary and non-monetary incentives for conservation and sustainable forest management; promotion of sustainable best practices in cocoa, coffee, oil palm and livestock production, and sustainable forest management; strengthening of the National Forest Monitoring System; development of the multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms; development of local monitoring and early warning system; project monitoring and evaluation; and project management.

GEF resources will be used to address efforts in developing an enabling framework for an integrated approach to sustainable management and production in MULs of the CTEA that envisages the development of policies, plans and participatory strategies that improve inter-institutional and intersectorial coordination; strengthening opportunities for dialogue and consensus; capacity building of national and provincial stakeholders, access to finance and markets for sustainable production and promotion of sustainable production practices, conservation and restoration for the long-term protection of global and local values of the CTEA. This will be done through the provision of incremental funding to add on to investments already being made by project partners. In addition the design phase has also contributed to triggering other synergies with investment for upscaling by ensuring key barriers are overcome. (see Section A.6 below on coordination efforts section). As such the project can be deemed as entirely incremental.

#### 5) *Global environmental benefits (GEFTF):*

Global environmental benefits have been assessed in more detail. The project will provide the following benefits:

- 1,859,600 hectares of MUL and HCVF outside of protected areas that maintain the supply of ecosystem services (including conservation of biodiversity, soils, water resources and carbon sequestration) through a strengthened multi-level governance framework and capacities based on landscape to be achieved through direct project intervention in three priority landscapes;
- 3,328.813 hectares that can be potentially achieved through indirect effect of project intervention (replication), and 6,470.386 hectares (remaining forest areas of the CTEA in the long term);
- Reduced direct pressure of productive sectors on forests, evidenced by the change in forest and ecosystem fragmentation patterns and landscape structure: 10% reduction in historical deforestation rate for the 3 landscapes;
- 257,566.69 tCO<sub>2e</sub> (direct lifetime emissions in Morona y Zamora cantons over 6 years of project duration) and 8,749,801,14 tCO<sub>2e</sub> (indirect lifetime emissions in the CTEA over 20 years);
- 432,243 hectares of HCVFs conserved through incentives in community and indigenous lands (in protective forests and PSB conservation areas).
- 172,646 hectares of three target landscapes covered by environment-friendly best practices following best practice manuals and guidelines, based on landscape, gender and inter-cultural approaches that contribute to establishing deforestation free supply chains;
- Increased adoption of agrosilvopastoral systems in three target landscapes that enhance landscape connectivity and structure;
- 18,660 hectares where land degradation has been reduced through SLM practices;
- 67,808 hectares of the Kutuku Shaimi protective forest managed under SFM and biodiversity criteria.

These GEBs will also translate into direct benefits for species many of which are significant globally (for a list of species see Section III Strategy of the GEF-UNDP Project Document, page 24).

For details on how the GEB targets will be measured please refer to Annex A Project Results Framework of this CEO Endorsement Request below and Annex B Monitoring Plan of the GEF-UNDP Project Document. For an explanation on the calculation method for the CO<sub>2</sub>e target please refer to the SFM Tracking Tool.

6) *Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up*

The project's innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up have been described in detail. Kindly refer to Section V "Feasibility" (pages 62-71) of the GEF-UNDP Project document.

A.2. *Child Project?* If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

No.

A.3. *Stakeholders.* Identify key stakeholders and elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project. Do they include civil society organizations (yes  /no )? and indigenous peoples (yes  /no )?

During the PPG phase consultation workshops were undertaken in each of the six provinces of the Amazon region with key stakeholders, including indigenous nationalities, production associations, civil society and local staff of public ministries, provincial and local governments and related programs. A consultation workshop with NGOs and a seminar on UNDP's Green Commodities Program including NGOs and other stakeholders, were held in Quito. Three workshops (one in Quito and two in the Amazon region) were held to finalize the logical framework. In addition, the draft project document was shared with stakeholders who participated in the consultation process and comments and inputs were received, and a final workshop was held to discuss the comments and inputs received to this draft. Over 450 people were interviewed or participated in the workshops.

The project strategy is built upon the active participation of public, private and civil society partners. Responsibilities of these partners in the implementation of the project, as well as the initiatives supported by them in addressing the project's development challenges have been summarized in Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8 on pages 49-59 of the GEF-UNDP project document. The project will involve Civil Society Organizations, private sector producers associations and commodity companies, and local communities, as summarized in Table 9, pages 60-61 of the GEF-UNDP project document.

A.4. *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.* Elaborate on how gender equality and women's empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men. In addition, 1) did the project conduct a gender analysis during project preparation (yes  /no )?; 2) did the project incorporate a gender responsive project results framework, including sex-disaggregated indicators (yes  /no )?; and 3) what is the share of women and men direct beneficiaries (women %, men %)?

The gender analysis undertaken assessed the current policies and commitments of Ecuador in regards to environment and gender equality and gender related issues in the Ecuadorian Amazon, covering the role of women in the use of natural resources and agricultural production, use of time, gender based violence, poverty in the target landscapes. The

analysis identified several gaps related to parity in decision-making spaces; improvement of women's incomes and livelihoods; use of time; and access to, and control of resources.

Based on the gender analysis, the project has developed a strategy that seeks to raise awareness of the project team and other key stakeholders on the concept of gender approach for sustainable development; empower women through the design of specific activities addressing the improvement of their livelihoods and their families; and identify and collect disaggregated and gender specific information to measure effectiveness of project implementation, participation, empowerment and improvement of the livelihoods of Amazonian women, especially indigenous women.

The project will mainstream gender equality through a number of strategies. These include: i) mainstreaming of gender and inter-cultural approaches in Land Use and Development Plans (LUDP); ii) training programs will include a gender awareness raising module that includes empowerment of family groups and organizations to raise awareness on the division of roles and a more equitable distribution of work loads between men and women and show how women, especially indigenous women, use their time; iii) fostering participation of women in planning and decision-making in dialogue and coordination platforms (at least 40% participation of women and 60% participation of indigenous peoples); iv) developing an edu-communication strategy with contents and materials in line with family realities, ethnicity, and respect for local cultural practices and traditional knowledge; v) assessments and studies will include methodologies that disaggregate data by sex, age, ethnicity to assess population statistics, family income, number of women and youths, population characteristics, number of male and female heads of households, roles of family members in productive systems, and roles of indigenous families located in critical areas for conservation; vi) identifying specific opportunities for business and market access for women and indigenous peoples in market and feasibility studies, and action plans; vii) developing a competitive grants mechanism emphasizing in indigenous women and youths to support startups for income generation through sustainable use of biodiversity products; viii) best practices guidelines and training and technical assistance programs will be prepared based on a gender and inter-cultural approach; ix) equal participation of women and indigenous peoples in trainings, meetings and technical assistance; x) promoting participation of men and women in technical assistance teams, preferably mixed teams to create an enabling environment for gender and inter-cultural mainstreaming; xi) training and technical assistance will take into account the work schedules of producers and their families for minimum interference with the daily chores of men and women in order to ensure their participation in the activities organized by the project. Given that indigenous women are in charge of traditional *ajás* and *chakras* an important aspect to be taken into account is that training and technical assistance in these cases be delivered by female technicians and local promoters, respecting their cosmovision and traditional knowledge, fostering dialogue and learning by doing; xiii) SFM and NTFP management plans will mainstream gender and inter-cultural issues - including traditional knowledge, cultural uses of the forest and inter-cultural dialogue - and will include specific activities targeting women (e.g. training, specific business opportunities and value adding initiatives); xi) promoting access of women to incentives and financial products for sustainable production, value adding and alternative livelihoods (aquaculture, apiculture, sustainable tourism); and xii) promoting exchange visits for groups of women and youths to successful experiences. Project M&E will take into account collecting and monitoring sex-disaggregated and inter-cultural data related to governance, participation, access to credits and incentives, and sustainable production as well as participatory methodologies.

The different gender mainstreaming strategies will generate a number of lessons that will be documented and shared with the relevant institutions and with the Gender Equality Council, national body in charge of gender policies so that it may promote replication of the strategies through their work within the public sector.

As can be seen in the Project Results Framework (Annex A of this CEO Endorsement Request and Section VI "Project Results Framework", pages 73-80 of the GEF-UNDP project document, the Results Framework is gender responsive and contains sex-disaggregated indicators. The share of women and men direct beneficiaries varies according to the activities. Percentages are indicated in the corresponding indicators.

**A.5 Risk.** Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

Kindly refer to Table 10 Risks on pages 65-68 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document. As per standard UNDP requirements, the Project Coordinator will monitor risks quarterly and report on the status of risks to the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP Country Office will record progress in the UNDP ATLAS risk log. Risks will be reported as critical when the impact and probability are high (i.e. 5). Management responses to critical risks will also be reported to the GEF in the annual PIR.

*A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.* Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

*Institutional arrangements:* The Implementing Partner for this project is the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Aquaculture and Fisheries (MAGAP) responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources. Please refer to Section VIII. Governance and Management Arrangements, pages 85-90 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document for the institutional arrangements for project implementation.

*Planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects:* The project will coordinate the implementation of its components/products/activities with several other ongoing GEF projects. Coordination will take place through several mechanisms: i) The Project Technical Committee and Working Groups will facilitate coordination through exchange of information on ongoing and planned initiatives of the members; ii) formal and informal meetings for exchange of information and lessons between the proposed project and other GEF, government and donor funded projects and programs; and iii) joint planning exercises and common implementation approaches.

- GEF-UNDP Project #4731 “Advancing Landscape Approaches in Ecuador’s National Protected Area System to Improve Conservation of Globally Endangered Wildlife”. This project has intervention areas in the Amazon Region and can provide lessons on experiences in wildlife management, alternative livelihoods and monitoring/surveillance that may be applied by the proposed project, especially in Central Amazon and Southern Amazon where sustainable forest management will be promoted.
- GEF-FAO Project #4774 “Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, Forests, Soil and Water to Achieve the Good Living in the Napo Province”. Synergies will be promoted through exchange visits and replication of methodologies. This project may provide lessons and experiences on sustainable production of coffee and cocoa, SFM, and sustainable use of biodiversity in Northern Amazon; and mainstreaming of environmental criteria in LUDPs. The proposed project will provide the GEF-FAO project with lessons related to oil palm production and commercialization not included in that project but necessary to control the expansion of oil palm toward the province.
- GEF-FAO Project #4775 “Promotion of Climate-smart Livestock Management integrating Reversion of Land Degradation and Reduction of Desertification Risks in Vulnerable Provinces”. Exchange visits and replication of methodologies will be sought to mainstream lessons by this project in the interventions of the proposed project in Southern Amazon as well as upscaling to the whole of the Amazon Region.
- GEF-UNDP Project #3829 “Sustainable Financing of Ecuador’s National System of Protected Areas (SNAP) and Associated Private and Community-managed PA Subsystems”, which has developed processes and regulations to promote private and community protected areas, which will be applied by the proposed project in Central Amazon.
- GEF-UNDP Project #5534 “Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Diversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources” which seeks promote access and benefit sharing agreements for monetary and non-monetary benefits favoring protected areas. Potential for replication of methodologies will be explored given that access and benefit sharing is a possible financial mechanism to support conservation and sustainable use of CTEA forests.

- GEF-UNDP Project #9460 “Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Ecuador”. The SGP includes promoting landscape approach and connectivity corridors, therefore the SGP and the proposed project are aligned. Exchange of methodologies and lessons will be undertaken.

The project will closely coordinate with the Project “Priming Financial and Land-Use Planning Instruments to Reduce Emissions from Deforestation” to be funded by the Green Climate Fund (GCF). This will support the implementation of the National REDD Strategy and Action Plan that includes priority actions and measures to reduce and avoid deforestation focusing primarily on the Amazon. A program approach has been design whereby multiple funding sources are contributing to the reduced deforestation. Each is supporting a specific part of the larger picture and synergies and complementarities have been optimised during the design phase of this GEF initiative. By setting up a governance framework for sustainable production based on a landscape approach and implementing this in three landscapes the GEF-UNDP project will overcome barriers and help catalyse the transformation of land use planning and management. The broader program with the GCF and other resources will take this further to scale across the entire Amazon region priming financial and land-use planning instruments.

Furthermore, close coordination will be held with the GEF-6 Integrated Approach Pilot Taking Deforestation out of Commodities Supply Chain, which includes palm oil among its target commodities. The proposed interventions in Northern Amazon contain common elements and approaches with this IAP in terms of developing an enabling environment for sustainable production of oil palm while at the same time supporting forest conservation and reduction of deforestation in the landscape. Interventions addressing policies, dialogue roundtables, enforcement of regulations and capacity development of national and local governments will benefit from Production project of the IAP lessons and vice versa. Moreover, a close link will be maintained with the IAP’s Demand Project so that partnerships with markets for deforestation free palm oil buyers can be shared with Ecuador. Learning and sharing will be undertaken in the context of IAP’s Learning and Adaptive Management Component under UNDP leadership.

For an overview of the planned coordination with other initiatives being undertaken at national level, kindly refer to Tables 5, 6, 7 and 8, pages 49-59 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document, under the heading “Other on-going initiatives/baseline projects, which contribute towards the project’s results”.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

*A.7 Benefits.*

The project will undertake a number of key interventions to promote income generation and improving the livelihoods of its target groups, in particular small farmers and indigenous peoples, women and youths. The project will support the establishment of Local Development Agencies at municipal level, within the local governments that meet the minimum requirements to ensure their functioning and sustainability. These agencies will have the objective of promoting local economies and livelihoods through business incubation such as those based on sustainable use of biodiversity; and will support local initiatives based on an integrated approach to sustainable supply chains. The agencies will provide training and technical assistance to target groups, emphasizing in indigenous women and youths. The project will also develop a competitive grants mechanism to finance innovative income-generating startups (up to USD 50,000) for sustainable production, value adding and commercialization of NTFPs and complementary livelihood options (e.g. aquaculture, meliponiculture and sustainable community tourism) to reduce forest degradation and illegal extraction of wood. These grants will be directed mainly to indigenous communities, and especially women and youths. The project will support beneficiaries of the Socio-Bosque Program, which provides conservation incentives, to strengthen the long-term investment potential of the conservation incentive to support conservation, restoration and sustainable production in community lands and individual properties through developing new proposals for investing the resources in activities that will contribute to deforestation free production, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and securing the supply of ecosystem services (e.g. sustainable forest and NTFP management, SLM and environment-friendly production practices). Furthermore, interventions to promote uptaking of sustainable best practices in coffee, cocoa, oil palm and livestock production include small farmers and indigenous peoples as target groups. These groups will receive training and technical assistance to improve production and productivity thereby increasing their incomes and their livelihoods. Project targets for increased incomes include: a) increase in average annual household income from crop and livestock production from USD 2,957 to USD 3,252. These incomes will come from best practices, which will increase

productivity as well as from the impact of the work to be undertaken through the dialogue and coordination platforms for sustainable supply chains; b) increase in average annual household income from forest and tree products from USD 132 to USD 145. These incomes will come from SFM and NTFP best practices as well as through support of the local development agencies in building the capacities of the beneficiaries; and c) increase annual household income from permanent incentive schemes from USD 1,432 to USD 1,575. These incomes will be accrued through MAGAP and Socio-Bosque Program incentives as well as future payment schemes in line with the REDD+ action plan and GCF project.

#### *A.8 Knowledge Management.*

Project Outcome 4 “Dissemination of lessons learned, monitoring & evaluation”, includes a specific output addressing publication and dissemination of knowledge products, best practices and lessons learned. The project will publish nine reports systematizing project experiences, best practices and lessons learned, in electronic formats (DVDs) and on-line (mailing lists, partners’ websites and social media). These reports will approach different themes covering: i) integrated management of MUL; ii) platforms for sustainable supply chains successful cases; iii) territorial coordination in the Amazon region based on a landscape approach; iv) lessons learned by the platforms for sustainable supply chains; v) case studies on sustainable production best practices based on gender and inter-cultural approaches; vi) sustainable production best practices guidelines; viii) project lessons learned. Publications will include information on the methodologies applied, the difficulties encountered, as well as the projects’ successes and their compliance with the project’s objectives.

Training will be undertaken to build the institutional and stakeholder capacities from the public, private and civil society sectors for mainstreaming the landscape approach in institutional planning processes and to enable them to implement, monitor and evaluate land use and development plans under the new approach. Furthermore, training will build the capacities of producers’ to adopt environmentally sustainable production practices. Training will be undertaken through workshops, courses, and exchange of experiences, including on-line training to ensure reaching a wide audience. Training materials will be made available through the project’s and partners’ websites.

All project knowledge products will be shared with the multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms to be established with project support, thereby reaching an important number of institutions in each sector at regional level. Furthermore, gender mainstreaming strategies will generate a number of lessons that will be documented and shared with the relevant institutions and with the Gender Equality Council so that it may uptake such strategies and disseminate them at national level. To support dissemination of lessons-learned and experiences at regional and national levels and to other Amazonian countries the project will make use of existing online communities of practice such as the Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) Amazon, the UNDP-Yammer group and UNDP-Exposure platforms, UNDP corporate webpages at national, regional and global levels as well as government platforms, especially the MAE webpage and newsletters. This will help ensure access to this information by the wider stakeholder community to the experiences, failures and successes of the project

#### **B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:**

**B.1 Consistency with National Priorities.** Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:

The project is aligned with the Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador, which recognizes the rights of nature declaring its public utility, promotes sustainable development in order to ensure natural resources for future generations and mentions the need to take measures to address climate change. Related articles are: i) Art. 14: recognizes the right of people to live in a healthy and ecologically- balanced environment that guarantees sustainability and good living (sumak kawsay); environmental preservation, conservation of ecosystems, biodiversity and integrity of the genetic heritage, prevention of environmental damage, and the recovery of degraded natural areas are matters of public interest; ii) Art. 395 recognizes the following environmental principles: 1) The State will guarantee a sustainable model of development,

environmentally- balanced and respectful of cultural diversity that conserves biodiversity and natural regeneration capacity of ecosystems and ensures the satisfaction of the needs of present and future generations; 2) The environmental management policies will be applied transversally and shall be mandatory for all levels of the State, and for all people in the country; 3) The State shall ensure the active and permanent participation of individuals, communities, peoples and affected nations in the planning, execution and control of all activities that might generate environmental impacts; and 4) In case of doubt regarding the scope of the legal provisions on environmental issues, they will be applied in the more favorable sense to the protection of nature; iii) Art. 414 stipulates that the State shall take appropriate and cross-cutting measures to mitigate climate change by limiting GHG emissions, deforestation and air pollution; the State will take steps for the conservation of forests and vegetation, and protect the population at risk.

The project is also aligned with the National Plan for Good Living 2013-2017. Its objectives address renewable and non-renewable natural resources use, and improvement of livelihoods. Among them: Objective 7: To guarantee the rights of nature, and promote territorial and global sustainability; Objective 8: To consolidate the social and solidary economic system, in a sustainable manner; and Objective 10: To promote the transformation of the productive matrix.

The project is consistent with the National Environmental Policy, which is the framework for the implementation of environmental policies and seeks to ensure adequate socio-environmental management in Ecuador. The policy seeks to make Ecuador "a country that preserves and makes appropriate use of its biodiversity so as to maintain and improve the quality of life by promoting sustainable development and social justice, recognizing water, soil and air as strategic natural resources". Policy 2 addresses the efficient use of strategic resources for sustainable development: water, air, soil and biodiversity; and Policy 3 addresses the management of adaptation to climate change to reduce social, economic and environmental vulnerability and strategies for: mitigating impacts on people and ecosystems caused by climate change, natural and anthropogenic events; implementation of comprehensive risk management to cope with extreme weather events; reduction of GHG emissions in the social and production sectors.

The project is coherent with the National Biodiversity Policy and Strategy, which promotes a vision of sustainable conservation and use of biodiversity by the year 2020, through several strategic guidelines: (i) consolidate and enhance the sustainability of the productive activities that use native biodiversity; (ii) ensure the existence, integrity and functionality of the components of biological diversity: ecosystems, species and genes; (iii) balance the pressures for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity; and (iv) ensure that the benefits of biodiversity conservation and use, traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of local people and communities, are fairly distributed.

The project is also consistent with the National Climate Change Strategy 2012-2025, which seeks to achieve by 2025 an adequate management of the challenges of climate change thus guaranteeing the good living and the rights of nature. The strategy prioritizes several sectors including: i) food sovereignty, agriculture, aquaculture and fisheries; ii) water resources; and iii) ecosystems.

The project is coherent with the National REDD+ Action Plan, in particular its Strategic Component 3, which has the objective of increasing the sustainability of areas under forest management and increase the initiatives for use of non-wood forest products within a framework of forest governance, bio-knowledge and biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. The action plan proposes to this effect several activities, namely improvement of the sustainable forest management practices, traceability, certification, and public and private responsible purchases.

The project is in line with Amazonian Productive Transformation Agenda, which has the objective of reconverting agricultural production activities in the Amazon into sustainable agro-productive systems taking into account the economic, social, environmental and cultural dimensions through comprehensive farm planning for crop diversification and reforestation. Its specific objectives are: i) to develop mechanisms for information and management of land tenure and land use to enable formulation of comprehensive farm plans for systemic productivity under an agro-productive reconversion approach and to fulfill the social and environmental function of the land; ii) promote sustainable agro-productive development of the Amazon's rural population through incentives, credit, technical assistance and participatory rural extension, within a framework of comprehensive farm planning; and iii) strengthen productive chains through activities that promote systemic competitiveness and facilitate equitable trade.

The project is consistent with the National Action Plan for Green Exports 2015-2019, which seeks to strengthen the specialized offer of sustainable export products, one of them being cocoa and its Objective 1: creation and strengthening of a dynamic base of sustainable products; and Objective 2: improvement of the international market access.

The project is also aligned with the Amazon Integral Plan, which seeks to achieve by 2035 the adequate and sustainable territorial development of the Ecuadorian Amazon region through biodiversity conservation, livelihood improvement and productive diversification in accordance with the specific characteristics of the region to achieve the Good Living. The project is consistent with several of its strategic objectives: Objective 3) Revalue the ancestral knowledge and bio-knowledge based on the high Amazonian diversity generating capacities and opportunities for local development; Objective 5) Promote productive diversification and specialization of human resources in activities that generate added value with territorial relevance, ensuring equitable access to production means; and Objective 6) Reduce habitat degradation, ecosystem fragmentations and overuse of soils prioritizing the conservation of areas of ecological significance and control of extractive activities.

The project is coherent with the Land Use and Development Plans of the Amazonian provinces and selected cantons for on the ground interventions. LUPDs are the instruments through which the Decentralized Autonomous Governments are guided for the implementation of public policy regarding the use and occupation of urban and rural areas; and generally consist of two parts, a diagnosis and the plans themselves. In both cases the following components must be analyzed: Environment, Economy, Socio-cultural and political-institutional, human settlements, Mobility, Energy and Connectivity.

The project falls under the UNDAF Outcomes 4: By 2018, support has been provided to strengthening institutional and citizen capacities to promote the rights of nature, create conditions for a sustainable development, and improve the resilience and risk management facing the impacts of climate change and natural and man-made disasters; and 5: By 2018, support has been provided to strengthening institutional and citizen capacities for socioeconomic inclusion of priority groups and promotion of sustainable and equitable livelihoods, in line with the change in the productive matrix and the popular and solidarity economy.

The project is consistent with the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and will contribute to their achievement, particularly Strategic Goal B: *Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use*, Target 5: *By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced* and Target 7: *By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity*; and under Strategic Goal D: *Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services*, Target 14: *By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable*; and Target 15: *By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification*

Furthermore, the project is consistent with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in particular SDG Goals 2, 5, 12 and 15 and its targets: Goal 2 *End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture*, and its targets 2.3 *By 2030, double the agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment*; and 2.4 *By 2030, ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agricultural practices that increase productivity and production, that help maintain ecosystems, that strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality*; Goal 5 *Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls* and its target 5.5 *Ensure women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life*; Goal 12 *Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns*, and its target 12.2 *By 2030, achieve the sustainable management and efficient use of natural resources*; Goal 15 *Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss* and its targets 15.2 *By 2020, promote*

*the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally; 15.3 By 2030, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land degradation-neutral world; 1.5.5 Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species; and 15.9 By 2020, integrate ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning, development processes, poverty reduction strategies and accounts.*

**C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:**

Please refer to Table 6, pages 84-86 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

**PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY**

**A. GEF Agency certification**

**This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.**

<b>Agency Coordinator, Agency Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date (MM/dd/yyyy)</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator.		11/14/2016	Helen Negret, EBD Senior Technical Advisor	+507 302- 4510	helen.negret@undp.org

## ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

<b>This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):</b>					
Goal 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss					
<b>This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document:</b>					
Outcome 4: By 2018, support has been provided to strengthening institutional and citizen capacities to promote the rights of nature, create conditions for a sustainable development, and improve the resilience and risk management facing the impacts of climate change and natural and man-made disasters.					
Outcome 5: By 2018, support has been provided to strengthening institutional and citizen capacities for socioeconomic inclusion of priority groups and promotion of sustainable and equitable livelihoods, in line with the change in the productive matrix and the popular and solidarity economy.					
<b>This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:</b>					
Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste					
	Objective and Outcome Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term Target	End of Project Target	Assumptions
<b>Project Objective:</b> Catalyze the transformation of land use planning and management in the Ecuadorian Amazon (CTEA) by building a governance and sustainable production framework based on a landscape approach and optimizing ecosystem services and livelihoods	Surface area in hectares of MUL and HCVF outside of protected areas that maintain the supply of ecosystem services (including conservation of biodiversity, soils, water resources and carbon sequestration) through a strengthened multi-level governance framework and capacities based on landscape approach, as evidenced by: a) Number of hectares covered through direct project intervention in the 3 priority landscapes <sup>7</sup> b) Number of hectares that can be potentially covered through indirect effect of project intervention (replication) <sup>8</sup> c) Number of hectares of the CTEA in the long term <sup>9</sup>	0		a) 1,859,600 • Northern Amazon: 765,670. • Central Amazon: 615,914 • Southern Amazon: 478,016  b) 3,328,813  c) 6,470,386 (in the long term)	Political will of institutions to enforce the regulatory frameworks, monitor compliance, allocate resources and incentives to mainstream landscape approach and promote sustainable production and conservation. Stakeholders willingly engage in complying with the regulations, adopting best practices and participating in sustainable and deforestation free supply chains. International markets favor sustainable production
	Reduced direct pressure of productive sectors on forests, evidenced by the change in forest and ecosystem fragmentation patterns and landscape structure (measured by annual change in border length between intervened	Baseline and targets to be defined in year 1		10% reduction in historical deforestation rate for the 3 landscapes. Target for annual change in border	Institutions undertake adequate monitoring of changes in coverage and land use as per the regulatory framework Producers actively engage in

<sup>7</sup> Surface area of the selected cantons (Orellana and Shushufindi in Northern Amazon, Taisha in Central Amazon, and Morona and Nangaritza in Southern Amazon) less the surface area of protected areas and urban areas/infrastructure.

<sup>8</sup> Surface area of the provinces of Orellana, Sucumbios, Morona Santiago and Zamora-Chinchipe where the target landscapes are located minus the surface area of the target landscapes

<sup>9</sup> Surface area of MUL/HCVF (outside of protected areas) of the CTEA minus the surface area of b)

	areas and remaining vegetation within a reference period, as per MAE methodology <sup>10</sup> ), which improves conservation of threatened species <sup>11</sup>			length between intervened areas and remaining vegetation to be defined in year 1	trainings, complying with regulations, implementing best practices and participating in sustainable supply chains
	Tons of avoided emissions of CO <sub>2</sub> e attained through protection and sustainable management of forests <sup>12</sup> : a) Direct lifetime b) Indirect lifetime	0		a) 257,566.69 tCO <sub>2</sub> e (In Morona y Zamora over 6 years) b) 8,749,801.14 tCO <sub>2</sub> e (In CTEA over 20 years)	Institutions, producers and communities get involved and participate investing in measures for protection and sustainable management of forests to avoid CO <sub>2</sub> emissions.
	Level of improvement of family incomes derived from land uses in line with LUDPs, measured by the increase in: a) Percentage of family income from diversified agricultural production with agroforestry production systems b) Percentage of family income from wood and non-wood products c) Percentage of family income from Socio-Bosque incentives d) Percentage of women's incomes from non-wood products e) Percentage of producers from indigenous nationalities located in protective forests from non-wood products	a) 2,957 USD/yr b) 132 USD/yr (0,2 - 0,3% of total family income) c) 1,432 USD/yr d) Tbd in year 1 through surveys disaggregated by age, sex and ethnic group e) Tbd in year 1 through surveys		a) 10% b) 10% c) 10% d) 20% e) 20%	Local communities of the target landscapes, especially women and indigenous nationalities diversify their income sources with wood and non-wood products, and agroforestry production systems to increase incomes and improve livelihoods
	Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or sub-national level.	0	6 (1 Platform for Territorial Coordination with Multiple Use Landscape (MUL) and High Conservation Value Forests (HCVF)	6 (The 5 platforms and 1 roundtable established at mid-term) functioning with action plans and budgets, with at least 40%	Political will to develop partnership mechanisms in association with different sectors and allocation of financial, technical and administrative resources for sustainability of results.

<sup>10</sup> Methodology is based on measurements of deforestation maps 1990-2000 and 2010-2014, land use and coverage map 2014, ecosystem fragmentation map 2015. Methodology is explained in the MAE's document "MAE-UIA/SUIA, CONDESAN, GIZ, PNUD, UASB. Marco conceptual y propuesta de indicadores nacionales de biodiversidad. 2015.

<sup>11</sup> In line with SDG target 15.2 indicator 15.2.2 net permanent forest loss

<sup>12</sup> CO<sub>2</sub> emissions calculations are based on the volume of wood harvested (based on permits issued by MAE) in the provinces of Morona Santiago and Zamora Chinchipe (project intervention areas for SFM) over 6 years (direct lifetime emissions) and in the six Amazon provinces over 20 years (indirect lifetime emissions). See SFM Tracking Tool for detailed explanation on calculation of direct and indirect lifetime emissions (CO<sub>2</sub> Calculation Sheet)

			approach; 4 Regional Platforms for Sustainable Supply Chains of coffee, cacao, livestock and palm oil; 1 Roundtable for Wood, Non-wood and Biodiversity Products) established with at least 40% membership of either sex and 60% membership from indigenous nationalities	membership of either sex and 60% membership from indigenous nationalities	
<b>Outcome 1</b> Strengthened multi-level governance framework for sustainable management and production in multiple use landscapes (MUL) and high value conservation forests (HVCF) in the Special Amazonian Territorial Circumscription (CTEA)	Improved institutional capacities of 7 institutions for effective sustainable planning and management in MUL in a coordinated and articulated manner, as measured by a % of increase in the UNDP Capacity Scorecard (Score rating: 0: Inefficient; 1: Good; 2: Very Good; 3: Excellent).	MAE: 1 MAGAP: 2 GAD Orellana: 1 GAD Shushufindi: 1 GAD Taisha : 1 GAD Morona : 2 GAD Nangaritza: 1	MAE: 2 MAGAP: 2 GAD Orellana : 2 GAD Shushufindi : 1 GAD Taisha : 1 GAD Morona : 2 GAD Nangaritza: 1	MAE: 3 MAGAP: 3 GAD Orellana : 3 GAD Shushufindi: 2 GAD Taisha : 2 GAD Morona : 3 GAD Nangaritza: 2	The institutions recognize the need to improve institutional processes, collaboration and cooperation to better fulfill their mandates and incorporating management based on landscape approach and environmental sustainability, and implement the proposed improvements for the CTEA.
	Number of planning and land use planning instruments that mainstream landscape approach, HCVF, biodiversity and ecosystem services considerations, gender and intercultural approaches in 5 cantons of the target landscapes approved, socialized and implemented: a) Cantonal Land Use and Development Plans (LUDP) updated b) Parish LUDPs elaborated c) National level regulations in support of sustainable production in MUL d) Local level ordinances that protect the natural resources (forests, water, biodiversity, wildlife) based on a landscape approach	a) 5 LUDPs not including environmental, gender and intercultural considerations b) 0 c) 0 d) 3	a) 5 updated, approved and socialized b) 5 elaborated, approved and socialized c) 2 MAE and MAGAP Inter-ministerial Agreements approved and socialized d) 8 Ordinances approved and socialized	a) 5 LUDPs implemented b) 5 LUDPs implemented c) 2 Inter-ministerial Agreements implemented d) 10 Ordinances implemented	Public and private institutions, CSOs recognize the need to improve land use planning, participate and mainstream management based on a landscape approach, environmental sustainability, gender and intercultural approaches, and implement these approaches
	Level of direct participation of women and members of indigenous nationalities in planning and management of MUL/HCFV in	Members are mostly men	a) At least 25% b) At least 40%	a) At least 40% b) At least 60%	Political will to incorporate key stakeholders, emphasizing in civil society, and improve their

	<p>participatory structures that operate regularly and democratically:</p> <p>a) Percentage of women in Citizen Assemblies, Cantonal Planning Councils and Territorial Coordination Platform</p> <p>b) Percentage of members of indigenous nationalities in in Citizen Assemblies, Cantonal Planning Councils and Territorial Coordination Platform</p>				capacities to participate in land use planning based on a landscape approach, develop regulations, and monitor compliance of plans and regulations
	Level of agreement by the Territorial Coordination Platform on a multi-level participatory governance involving central, provincial, cantonal and parochial levels based on a landscape approach and HCVFs.	0	1 Territorial Priorities Document <sup>13</sup> based on a landscape approach and Action Plan with budget and financing sources agreed and approved	1 Platform Action Plan funded and implemented (>80% compliance of planned actions for coordination)	Institutions are willing to optimize inter-institutional and inter-sectorial coordination and collaboration mechanisms and undertake joint actions toward the sustainable development of the CTEA
<b>Outcome 2</b> Access to markets, credit and incentives for sustainable production of the main products in multiple use and high conservation value landscapes of the CTEA	Level of agreement by the Regional Platforms for Sustainable Supply Chains on sustainable production approaches for the CTEA, including deforestation free supply chains, certification standards, environment-friendly best practices, land use planning, based on a landscape approach.	0	5 Regional Action Plans for Sustainable Supply Chains (coffee, cacao, livestock, palm, forest products) with budget and financing sources agreed	5 Regional Action Plans for Sustainable Supply Chains (coffee, cacao, livestock, palm, forest products) implemented (>80% compliance of planned actions)	Key stakeholders committed and involved in the development and operation of the Regional Platforms for Sustainable Supply Chains
	Increase in the volume of products commercialized in the target landscapes that respond to sustainable production criteria, measured by:	a) 2-3% of products from 3 target landscapes have organic certification. A minimum percentage is certified Fair Trade (in Taisha canton) b) Tbd in year 1	a) 10% b) 20%	a) 30% b) 30%	Government and producers and buyers of sustainable products are interested and work jointly promote sustainable products and certification schemes, and achieve differentiated prices
	Increase in volume of NTFP produced within the Socio-Bosque Program (PSB) that satisfies the demand identified by the Roundtable for	a) PSB investment plans allocate 23% of funds to	a) 10% b) 10%	a) 25% b) 35%	Government and producers and buyers of sustainable products are interested and work jointly

<sup>13</sup> Based on the UNDP-ART methodology

	Wood, Non-wood and Biodiversity Products, measure through: a) Percentage of increase in community and individual PSB investment plans that include NTFP production with management plans c) Volume of NTFP produced under management plans and commercialized in the national market (measured by MAE statistics)	productive activities (agriculture, ecotourism, and community funds), 37% to health and education, 22% to conservation (zoning, signage, salaries of rangers, equipment, and training) and 18% to organizational strengthening. b) Tbd in year 1			to promote mechanisms that favor sustainable production of NTFPs and commercialization.
	Degree to which financial institutions have mainstreamed environmental sustainability criteria in their loan portfolios for the CTEA measured by: a) Number of financial institutions that mainstream environmental criteria in their portfolios of financial products for the CTEA b) Percentage of their loan portfolios that mainstream environmental criteria c) Number of personnel trained in sustainable financing and inter-cultural issues.	a) 0 b) 0 c) 0	a) 5 financial institutions review their loan portfolios and mainstream environmental criteria b) 10% c) 60	a) 5 financial institutions have implemented new financial products with environmental criteria b) 25% c) 120	Financial institutions are interested and review their portfolios mainstreaming environmental sustainability criteria and developing credit lines and products to finance sustainable production, SFM, SLM best practices in the CTEA
	Number of hectares of HCVFs in community and indigenous lands (in protective forests and PSB conservation areas) conserved through incentives, as evidenced by: a) Hectares of protective forests with management plans that have mainstreamed ATPA integral farm management plans (for SLM) <sup>14</sup> b) Hectares of PSB forests with investment plans that mainstream SFM and SLM	a) 0 b) 0		a) 376,460 (North: 56,122 has Center: 41,085 has South: 279,253 has) b) 55,783 (North: 51,442 has; Center: 1,693 has; Sur: 2,648 has)	Key stakeholders in protective forests and community and indigenous lands benefited by PSB incentive are interested in improving the use of incentives for SFM and SLM practices that secure the supply of ecosystem services.
<b>Outcome 3</b>	Surface area of three target landscapes	a) 0	a) 2,115	a) 6,044	Public and private institutions

<sup>14</sup> Protective forest is category under MAE's responsibility. Even though there are productive activities allowed and undertaken in this category, MAGAP in general does not intervene in these forests. Within the framework of the Project, MAE and MAGAP/ATPA will coordinate so that the communities and individuals living in the forest receive assistance to prepare integral farm management plans. These plans are tools for landscape planning at farm level and the basis for delivery of incentives and technical assistance. They will serve to introduce the project's proposed sustainable productive practices in protective forests and promote biological corridors in areas where farms are located inside the forest and/or their buffer zones.

Landscape level implementation of sustainable practices in commercial production and livelihoods systems, aligned with the conservation and restoration of HVCF	covered by environment-friendly best practices following best practice manuals and guidelines, based on landscape, gender and inter-cultural approaches that contribute to establishing deforestation free supply chains <sup>15</sup> 16.	b) 0 c) 0 d) 0 e) 0	b) 4,178 c) 28,453 d) 9,188 Total: 43,934	b) 11,936 c) 94,845 d) 26,250 e) 33,571  Total: 172,646	mainstream sustainable production practices and are committed to transferring knowledge and technologies to producers through technical assistance, incentives and loans  Producers are committed to adoption of best practices for sustainable production of coffee, cacao, oil palm, livestock, SFM, NTFP, restoration of degraded areas, and conservation of forests and ecosystem services
	Degree of adoption of agrosilvopastoral systems in the 3 target landscapes that enhance landscape connectivity and structure, measured through the average Euclidian distance to the nearest natural vegetation patch weighted by area of the patches, as evidenced by: a) Increase in the number of hectares under agrosilvopastoral systems in process of being established in pasture lands or already deforested lands b) Increase in the number of hectares incorporating live fences with native tree species in livestock areas	a) ATPA expects to intervene 30% of the area occupied by pastures between 2015-2018 in 5 provinces (247,736 has)  b) Tbd in year 1	a) 10%  b) 10%	a) 30%  b) 35%	Producers are committed to adoption of best practices for sustainable production of coffee, cacao, oil palm, livestock, SFM, NTFP, restoration of degraded areas, and conservation of forests and ecosystem services

<sup>15</sup> In line with SDG Goal 2, indicator 2.4.1 area under agricultural sustainable practices

<sup>16</sup> Surface areas correspond to 30% of areas of coffee, cocoa and palm in Northern landscape, livestock in Southern landscape. Based on consultancy reports: Idrovo, Jorge. Consultoría en Mercados e Incentivos para Producción Sostenible para la Amazonía Ecuatoriana. 2016; Segarra, Pool. Consultoría para apoyo a la definición de tres paisajes piloto en el marco del proyecto “Manejo integrado de paisajes de uso múltiple y de alto valor de conservación para el desarrollo sostenible de la Región Amazónica Ecuatoriana”.

	<p>Level of reduction of land degradation in the three target landscapes evidenced through the change in ecosystem function in areas under restoration with native species, measured through GAD restoration reports that include: i) georeferencing of areas identified for restoration; ii) number of hectares to be restored; iii) identification of landholders; iv) Schedule of restoration activities; v) technical information on maintenance and management of the area under restoration (survival and replacement rates)<sup>17</sup></p>	<p>46,650 has of degraded lands<sup>18</sup> in 3 target landscapes based on land coverage map and land use capacity map</p>	<p>20%</p>	<p>40%</p>	<p>Land degradation in the three target landscapes is reduced through SLM practices with the active engagement of the local population</p>
	<p>Degree of improvement in sustainable forest and biodiversity management of the Kutuku Shaimi Protective Forest<sup>19</sup>, measured through: a) Increase in management effectiveness score for Protective Forests measuring: management and planning; monitoring and surveillance; environmental communication, education and participation; biodiversity management; public use and tourism. b) Number of hectares of protective forests managed under SFM and biodiversity criteria established in management plans c) Percentage of increase in the number of forest harvesting permits authorized by MAE on the basis of special management plans d) Percentage of increase in the number of Integral Forest Management Plans authorized by MAE</p>	<p>a) 0 b) 193,737 has of Kutuku Shaimi located in the Central and Southern target landscapes but not managed with SFM and biodiversity criteria c) 0 d) 0</p>	<p>a) Management effectiveness tool developed with baseline and targets and piloted with the Kutuku Shaimi Mancommunities b) 15% (29,060 has) c) 10% d) 10%</p>	<p>a) Management effectiveness tool implemented. Increase in management effectiveness score. b) 35% (67,808 has) c) 35% d) 35%</p>	<p>Communities living in protective forests are committed to conservation and sustainable management of their forests and biodiversity  Institutions undertake adequate monitoring and enforcement of management plans and the forest regulatory framework</p>
	<p>Number of small, medium and large producers (including women and members of indigenous nationalities) that have improved their knowledge, attitude and practices for implementation of best practices to conserve biodiversity, reduce</p>	<p>5,164 (baseline survey to determine level of knowledge, attitude and practices to be developed in year 1)</p>	<p>1,807 (at least 20% women and youths and 50% members of indigenous nationalities) have improved knowledge,</p>	<p>5,164 (at least 30% women and youths and 50% members of indigenous nationalities) have improved knowledge,</p>	<p>Producers are aware of the need to adopt sustainable and environment-friendly best practices and their advantages to help improve production, productivity, livelihoods and</p>

<sup>17</sup> In line with SDG target 15.3, indicator 15.3.1 Percentage of land that is degraded over total land area.

<sup>18</sup> Land degradation understood as reduction or loss of biological or economic productivity and the complexity of agricultural rainfed lands, agricultural irrigated lands, grasslands, forests and woodlands, produced in arid, semi-arid or dry sub-humid areas due to land uses or a process or combination of processes, including human activities and population trends, such as: soil erosion due to wind or water, degradation of physical, chemical and biological properties or economic properties of soils, and longlasting loss of natural vegetation (MAE Regulation AM 045/April 2014 on desertification, land degradation and drought)

<sup>19</sup> In line with SDG target 15.2, indicator 15.2.1 forest cover under sustainable forest management

	soil degradation and plan land use in the MUL of the three target landscapes (measured through surveys and including disaggregation by sex) <sup>20</sup>		attitude and practices with respect to baseline	attitude and practices with respect to baseline	climate change adaptation, participate in capacity building and adopt best practices
<b>Outcome 4</b> Dissemination of lessons learned, monitoring & evaluation	Level of project implementation and achievement of results (percentage of budgetary execution)		35%	100%	Project partners have the political will to make progress toward a sustainable city, assume project ownership and ensure sustainability of results.
	Mid-term review report and final evaluation report		1 (MTR)	1 (Final evaluation)	Findings from the MTR will be used to revise the project's progress and to establish the corrective measures to achieve project objectives.
	Number of publications on best practices and lessons learned (at least 1 on gender)		5 (1 report on lessons learned on MUL integrated management; 1 report on Regional Platforms case studies; 1 report on Methodologies for Coordination of the Amazon Territory; 1 report with education materials; 1 report on gender and inter-cultural mainstreaming in sustainable production)	4 (1 report systematizing project lessons learned; 1 report on lessons learned by Regional Platforms; 1 report containing case studies on sustainable production practices with gender and inter-cultural approach; 1 report best practice manuals and guidelines)	Project partners are open about project challenges and successes, as well as lessons-learned so these can be captured, published and disseminated at national and international level.

<sup>20</sup> Number of producers estimated for the target surface areas for coffee, cocoa, oil palm and livestock production. Based on consultancy reports: Idrovo, Jorge. Consultoría en Mercados e Incentivos para Producción Sostenible para la Amazonía Ecuatoriana. 2016; Segarra, Pool. Consultoría para apoyo a la definición de tres paisajes piloto en el marco del proyecto “Manejo integrado de paisajes de uso múltiple y de alto valor de conservación para el desarrollo sostenible de la Región Amazónica Ecuatoriana”.

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

**Responses to Council Comments**

Germany's comment	UNDP response
Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:	
<p><b>Concerning the institutional set-up and setting of the project:</b> Considering the thematic relevance, mandates and functions of MAGAP regarding the main project activities (productive activities and promotion of value chains) and its contribution with the highest amounts of co-financing (ATPA), it seems to be recommendable to have MAGAP together with MAE as Executing Partner (and not only MAE). In the opposite case there will be a high risk of conflicts related to mandate and functions between MAE and MAGAP. Germany hence suggests including MAGAP as an executing partner when preparing the final project proposal</p>	<p>During the PPG phase MAE and MAGAP have agreed to be co-executing partners in project implementation. Both institutions, together with UNDP are members of the Project Board and are also part of other project management bodies, namely the Technical Committee and the Working Groups. In general terms, MAE has the principal responsibility over project Outcome 1, while MAGAP has the main responsibilities over project Outcomes 2 and 3. (please refer to Section VIII Governance and Management Arrangement, pages 86-91 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document for further details). Both institutions will allocate their infrastructure and facilities at central and regional (province and cantons) levels to facilitate project implementation.</p>
<p>The project's success seems to depend to a large degree on effective coordination between institutions (for example MAE-MAGAP) and between different administrative and political levels (for example MAGAP-GADs). Even when executing the project with both ministries, there is a considerable risk that the necessary coordination cannot be achieved. This poses a considerable risk for the project's success. Germany hence recommends that the final project proposal considers additional measures to manage this risk.</p>	<p>As mentioned in the PIF stage, inter-institutional coordination issues have been highlighted as a barrier and had been recognized as a potential risk to proper implementation and as such the proposal is being structured to address the risk. Project design includes several types of interventions to improve coordination between the different institutions and administrative and political levels. A capacity assessment of the institutions participating in the Project was undertaken (MAE, MAGAP and GADs) and the results have helped in designing the project strategies, including: a) national and sectorial level coordination through working with key ministries and their respective Citizen Sectorial Councils as well as between ministries and between councils; b) strengthening of decentralized institutional structures, including establishment of a multi-stakeholder territorial coordination platform for dialogue and agreement on land use planning issues; strengthening of local participatory mechanisms (e.g. Citizen Assemblies and Planning Councils); c) capacity building for improved coordination; d) Land Use and Development Plans strengthened with multi-sectoral dialogue &amp; decision-making mechanisms; and e) Regional Platforms for Sustainable Supply Chains for multi-stakeholder dialogue and consensus, reach agreements to promote deforestation free supply chains, and connect buyers of sustainable products with producers. Please refer to Section III Strategy and Section IV Results and Partnerships (pages 16-71) of the GEF-UNDP Project Document for further details).</p>
<p><b>Concerning content:</b> To guarantee consistency regarding Carbon-Values and deforestation risk, the project would benefit from using Ecuador's Forest Reference Emission Level as orientation, which can be requested of MAE (SCC) and is currently being reviewed in the context of the UNFCCC. Additionally, by the end of May 2015 MAE will publish the new deforestation map 2013, which allows for quantifying the deforestation of the period 2009-2013 and</p>	<p>Ecuador is in the process of validating the document "Forests for the Good Living: REDD+ Action Plan in Ecuador (2016-2025). Ecuador has submitted the Forest Reference Emission Levels (NREF-D) to the UNFCCC; has established a National Forest Monitoring System (SNMB) within the Unified Environmental Information System (SUIA) incorporates the Measuring, Monitoring, Reporting and Verifying processes; has designed the Safeguards Information System and is finalizing the development of instruments for its functioning. Of the four REDD+ pillars agreed during the COP16, Ecuador has formally submitted the NREF-D.</p>

Germany's comment	UNDP response
<p>represents a better baseline information for the project start (regarding actual deforestation risk and rates). Germany strongly suggests that the final project proposal considers this data source.</p>	<p>Within this framework, Ecuador does not have a reference level for sustainable forest management; therefore it is not possible to establish project targets based on avoided deforestation. Nevertheless the SNMB contains information generated by the Forestry National Directorate on the permits issued for wood harvesting, so it was agreed with MAE to undertake the calculation method for CO2 emissions avoided based on this data. The proposed targets are more conservative with respect to the PIF. The detailed calculation procedure is included as an additional sheet of the SFM Tracking Tool.</p>
<p><b>Regarding the baseline amount of the current initiatives in the project area (421 Mio USD) and the additionality of the project:</b> There are considerable baseline amounts and initiatives present in the area. The final project proposal should state how the project's impacts will be distinguished from the impacts of the baseline programs. ATPA is given as an example: At the moment ATPA-implementation is in a very early stage and still not fully designed. <b>The final project proposal should state clearly how "it will build on the baseline initiatives and especially the ATPA".</b></p>	<p>In fact there are many baseline activities that were identified in the PIF. The the PPG has mapped these out carefully to ensure that the project is additional. Not all the baseline funding has been maintained at the same level because of the economic crisis in Ecuador due to the decrease in oil prices; and in view of this we have been additionally careful to ensure we are still funding the incremental actions. The new resource restrictions have made the efficiency of resources even more important and this is why we have paid special attention to increasing coordination and synergies. Also we have now designed a co-executed project and the MAGAP will be able to shape there evolving design of the ATPA even better. Furthermore ATPA will be focusing on all areas and not only those with HCVF. The final design has paralleled the REDD strategy completion and by optimizing the synergies between them we have triggered other funds in a broad programme – one of the funder potentially being the Green Climate Fund through the Project "Priming Financial and Land-Use Planning Instruments to Reduce Emissions from Deforestation" to be shortly submitted for approval.</p>
<p>The proposed indicators are ambitious, as for example "30.000 ha under sustainable forest management". In the central and South Amazon the potential for sustainable use is limited. In the preparation of the final project proposal it should be verified that the indicators are realistic.</p>	<p>A detailed process was followed in selecting the landscapes for field interventions and together with the consultations has enabled being more precise in terms of the different areas under different land use types to establish indicators. Please see Section III Strategy, footnote 16 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document on selection process and response to STAP below on the landscape selection. The indicators are included in Section VI Project Results Framework of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>
<p><b>Concerning co-financing and cooperation:</b> The PIF states that "under the REDD+ Early Movers Programme an additional US\$ 11.4 m will be mobilized". Germany considers it necessary that the final project proposal states the exact source of this information.</p>	<p>This refers to the "Forest Conservation and REDD Program" (PCB-REDD). This program has a total budget of USD 14,152,570 (USD 12,627,570 provided by the KfW Development Bank and USD 1,535,000 financed by the government) with an implementation period from 21/01/2013 - 31/12/2019. The program has the objectives of strengthening the Ecuadorian State's capacity to increase and consolidate the forest conservation incentives program (Socio-Bosque), support complementary measures for protection and sustainable management of forests, and promote forest control in specific regions, access a future REDD+ mechanism and help in the implementation of a forest monitoring system and prevention of GHG emissions.</p>
<p>Germany seeks further specification on the cooperation between the project and ongoing programs. For example, the cooperation with the German Technical and Financial Cooperation in Ecuador could create synergies.</p>	<p>During the PPG dialogue was undertaken with GIZ, KfW and the "Forest Conservation and REDD Program" to ensure synergies for project implementation. KfW is a project co-financier through the Northern Amazon Program, taking into account its support to local initiatives within conservation areas for sustainable use of biodiversity and non-wood forest products, especially with indigenous peoples.</p>

## Responses to STAP Comments

STAP comments	UNDP response
<p>The logic of the project is clear, and its goals and intentions are sound and well-articulated with statements such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "catalyse the transformation of land use planning and management", <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• "build a governance and sustainable framework based on a landscape approach" <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• "developing the governance, financial and market frameworks for sustainable production and management of multiple use landscapes and delivery of global environmental benefits" <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• "develop bio-industry approaches to develop alternative livelihoods"</li> <li>• "ensure adequate enforcement of the environmental and forest regulations at local level" <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• "increase the demand for sustainable products" <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• "regularize process (e.g. licensing) to gradually mainstream sustainable environmental measures in the above value chains" <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• "foster the adoption of environment-friendly practice", <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• "promote sustainable use of biodiversity", <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>• "promote livestock best practices" and "support soil restoration and reforestation in mining areas" <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul> <p>What is missing is the "HOW?" In very few places does the document explicitly state or evaluate how these intentions will be operationalized.</p>	<p>The intervention logic now includes a detailed description of the activities, processes and methodologies to achieve the proposed outputs and outcomes. Kindly refer to Sections III. Strategy (pages 16-25) and IV. Results and Partnerships (pages 26-71) of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.</p>
<p>It also needs an analysis of whether a \$12m project can achieve all these goals. Therefore, the PPG needs to convert the conceptual/theoretical goals of the PIF into a project that is both operational and carefully costed, and this may require that the scope of the project is reduced, or significantly reduced. <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>During Project design 17 co-financiers have been identified with interventions in the Amazon region that are aligned with the project's objective. The sum of GEF resources plus this solid co-financing base will support the achievement of the proposed goals. Furthermore, the proposed Territorial Coordination Platform (please see Section IV. Results and Partnerships, Output 1.2, pages 27-29 of the GEF-UNDP Project Document) will be a long-term space where the different national and local sectors can align, take ownership and develop joint concrete actions in terms of coordinating and articulating development interventions in the CTEA; exchanging information on ongoing and planned interventions; sharing information, lessons and experiences; harmonizing criteria and methodologies; and identifying synergies. Additionally, a program approach has been design whereby multiple funding sources are contributing to the reduced deforestation. Each is supporting a specific part of the larger picture and synergies and complementarities have been optimised during the design phase of this GEF initiative. By setting up a governance framework for sustainable production based on a landscape approach and implementing this in three landscapes the GEF-UNDP project will overcome barriers and help catalyse the transformation of land use planning and management.</p>

STAP comments	UNDP response
	<p>The broader program with the Green Climate Fund and other resources will take this further to scale across the entire Amazon region priming financial and land-use planning instruments. The Ministry of Environment (MAE) and the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Aquaculture and Fisheries (MAGAP) are also the implementing partners of the GCF project and other programs and projects; therefore coordination will be undertaken within the responsible units of the MAE and MAGAP through joint planning exercises. The partnerships and multi-level coordination will serve to optimize synergies, the use of resources and the impact of the different interventions, thus helping to achieve the proposed goals.</p>
<p>The PIF incorporates a range of good ideas, including support of extension and stakeholder platforms, but these do not add up to a cogent theory of change. The PIF basically proposes a wide range of activities at meso and macro level, and the linkages between these activities and on-the-ground interventions and results is unclear, including in the indicators, most of which "are to be developed at PPG stage". This somewhat top-down approach often/usually results in a lot of workshops and planning, but limited real impact, with commentators noting that excellent ideas were developed but that implementation was weak. However, the situation in Ecuador may be different, and a top-down approach may be suitable; whatever the case, the PPG should provide additional confidence in the approach take to build multi-stakeholder governance systems. □</p>	<p>The Ecuadorian Constitution and the Participation Law establish that all planning processes of the Ecuadorian State shall be participatory. To this purpose, Ecuador has established a Citizen Participation System a different levels (national, provincial, municipal and parish), with participatory mechanisms at each level. Thus, at national level, the Ministries have Citizen Sectorial Councils, which are spaces for consultation and debate for design/updating of the National Development Plan and sectorial policies. At provincial, municipal and parish levels each Decentralized Autonomous Government (GAD) have Citizen Assemblies and Planning Councils. Citizen Assemblies are made up of citizens and constitute the space for public debate and dialogue with authorities on the provincial, municipal and parish priorities and for formulating policies and land use and development plans at each level. Planning Councils are made up of representatives of the local government and the Citizen Assemblies; they are the space where the local governments receive citizen inputs, requests and proposals through the representatives of the assemblies. Councils also participate in the process of defining priorities and formulating development plans and following their implementation. In this context, the project takes into account these structures and will contribute to strengthening these spaces to ensure that interventions follow a bottom-up approach. At national level, the project will support intra-sector dialogue between key Ministries and their Citizen Sectorial Councils as well as inter-sectorial dialogue between Ministries and Councils, seeking to improve coordination and integration of policies. At target landscape level (5 selected cantons) the project will support the establishment of Citizen Assemblies and strengthening of Planning Councils (through training and awareness raising) to support participation in the processes promoted by the project (e.g. municipal and parish land use and development plans). By improving the coordination between these levels the project will development of an enabling framework for an integrated approach to sustainable management and production in multiple use landscapes of the Amazon that envisages the development of policies, plans and participatory strategies that improve inter-institutional and intersectorial coordination; strengthening opportunities for dialogue and consensus; capacity building of national and provincial stakeholders, access to finance and markets for</p>

STAP comments	UNDP response
<p>There are four major conceptual issues that the PIF/PPG needs to address: □</p> <p>1. What exactly is a "strengthened multi-level governance framework" (see p1, Component 1, p16 in risks), how does the sequencing and structuring of this framework consider bottom-up as well as top-down processes, and what indicators</p>	<p>sustainable production and promotion of sustainable production practices, conservation and restoration for the long-term protection of global and local values of the CTEA (please refer to Figure 1 – Theory of Change, Section III Strategy of the GEF-UNDP Project Document, page 25).</p> <p>1) Ecuador has a multi-level Planning System covering the central, provincial, municipal and parish levels, with the roles and responsibilities of each level established by the national legal framework. The project will promote strengthening of this multi-level governance framework through inter-institutional and inter-sectorial dialogue and coordination at all levels. The Territorial Coordination Platform and the Regional Platforms for Sustainable Supply Chains will provide spaces for public, private and civil society stakeholders (national, provincial, municipal and parish levels) to engage, participate and reach agreements on key issues (e.g. land use planning, sustainable production, synergies). These platforms will thus constitute a mechanism to ensure balanced bottom-up and top-down processes. The Results Framework (Section VI of the GEF-UNDP Project Document) includes indicators that can help measure the expected effect (e.g. i) Number of planning and land use planning instruments that mainstream landscape approach, HCVF, biodiversity and ecosystem services considerations, gender and intercultural approaches in 5 cantons of the target landscapes approved, socialized and implemented; ii) Level of agreement by the Territorial Coordination Platform on a multi-level participatory governance involving central, provincial, cantonal and parochial levels based on a landscape approach and HCVFs; iii) Level of agreement by the Regional Platforms for Sustainable Supply Chains on sustainable production approaches for the CTEA, including deforestation free supply chains, certification standards, environment-friendly best practices, land use planning, based on a landscape approach).</p> <p>Furthermore, within this multi-level planning system, the municipal GADs constitute the level with the capacity to influence the lower levels (parish GADs and indigenous communities) and the upper levels (provincial GADs and national government) in terms of land use planning (see Specific Comments #3 below for further details). By working with the selected cantons in the target landscapes (e.g. capacity building, developing land use and development plans) the project's interventions may influence the provincial level as a whole.</p> <p>Additionally, the project will support MAE and MAGAP to jointly work in harmonizing existing regulations and developing new regulations as well as mainstreaming these regulations in local regulations, thereby promoting a real coordination of national and sectorial policies on natural resources, sustainable production and biodiversity conservation and use and with the local level.</p>

STAP comments	UNDP response
<p>can you use to measure if it works?</p> <p>2. What is "capacity-building" and how does this work?</p> <p>3. Can either of the above be achieved in the absence of significant investment in learning how to make □these work at field level, and using the process of making small gains to build stakeholder process, and also the guidelines, tools, norms, etc. necessary to mainstream these activities?</p>	<p>2) UNDP sees capacity development as the process through which individuals, organizations and societies obtain, strengthen and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development objectives over time. The Project design takes this definition and proposes the ways in which it will contribute to change mindsets and attitudes to bring about transformation that is generated and sustained over time from within. Capacity building will be undertaken following these steps: i) engaging stakeholders for capacity development; ii) assessing capacity assets and needs; iii) preparing capacity development plans; iv) implementing a capacity development response; and v) evaluating capacity development. To do so, the project will undertake: i) inter-sectoral and multi-stakeholder dialogue; ii) targeted training; iii) awareness raising; iv) exchange of experiences; v) systematization of experiences and lessons; vi) dissemination of experiences and lessons; vii) use of proven methodologies to build capacities for coordination and coordination (e.g. UNDP's ART methodology and commodity platforms methodology); viii) generating information and knowledge to fill in gaps and produce inputs for analysis and decision making (e.g. feasibility studies). The UNDP Capacity Scorecard has been completed for seven key institutions (MAE, MAGAP and the 5 municipal GADs of the target landscapes) with baseline scores, and a preliminary assessment of capacity building needs was undertaken, which served as the basis for identifying the proposed training programs under each outcome. During project implementation capacity building needs will be monitored (e.g. training evaluations) to ensure adjusting and/or updating the training programs. Progress of the seven institutions will be monitored and the UNDP Capacity Scorecard will be completed at mid-term and end of project to follow progress.</p> <p>3. The project will undertake several interventions to promote learning. It will foster knowledge management networks among NGOs, universities and communities to document best practices and lessons for different types of production in different landscape conditions and locations; and will link Ecuadorian networks with the Amazon SDSN for exchange of lessons and experiences. These activities will help identify successful practices that can be replicated within the Project as well as disseminating the findings from the field interventions. The Project will intervene in three selected landscapes in the North, Center and South that characterize the existing and emerging challenges in each sub-region and will serve to generate lessons that will be replicable to the other areas of the Amazon region. This will include developing best practice guidelines building on existing guidelines and regulations, and on the basis of these new guidelines training programs for public and private technicians (training-of-trainers methodology) who will in turn provide training and extension to producers (learning by doing</p>

STAP comments	UNDP response
<p>4. How will planning (top of p11) create change unless it also changes the underlying economics of biodiversity? This is to some extent addressed in Component 2, but the sections on planning should carefully consider costs and benefits to landholders who are ultimately deterministic of land use outcomes. □</p> <p>Therefore, the PIF/PPG should give more attention to the process of strengthening multi-level governance frameworks. Learning from systems theory, the top levels of the hierarchy should serve the bottom levels (Meadows 2008), and presumably planning/institutional development should balance top-down and bottom-up approaches; the current PIF is more top-down in tenor. An important question is whether rights (including land use plans, which operationalize and restrict some rights) are "appropriated from above" or emerge from below. Murphree (Murphree 2000) provides an excellent theoretical discussion of how to build institutions of scale, as does Ostrom in several case studies of irrigation projects in Sri Lanka I Governing the Commons (Ostrom 1990). (Child and Child 2015) describe the implementation of a bottom-up regulatory framework for natural resources in Zimbabwe in the 1940s. In other words, to what extent can we complement or replace top-down authority with bottom up incentives and participation?</p>	<p>methodology and field demonstrations). These interventions will provide cost-effective learning in support of the capacity building activities.</p> <p>4. The Project will generate a new model for land use management for the Amazon region, which will be based on the participatory identification of territorial priorities in line with national development goals; updated baseline assessments for each selected canton, containing environmental and socio-economic information; public, private and community stakeholders, including landholders, better understanding the global values of the Amazon and the underlying causes of biodiversity loss and with strengthened capacities to overcome the challenges through mainstreaming the landscape approach in land use planning policies and instruments; inter-sectorial regulatory and technical instruments to guide sustainable planning and production; and knowledge solutions and management supported by Universities and NGOs . This will allow the participatory construction, implementation and follow-up of Land Use and Development Plans that mainstream the landscape approach and within the framework of these plans, other site-specific land use planning instruments such as Integral Farm Plans, Sustainable Forest Management Plans and indigenous communities' Life Plans incorporating environment and biodiversity-friendly best practices. These elements will create the enabling environment for this new land use model that generates incomes and improves the livelihoods of the local population that respects cultural characteristics, and fosters the conservation and sustainable management of the Amazonian resources in line with the Amazonian Integral Plan approved recently and the Organic Law for the Amazon Special Territorial Circumscription under development.</p>
<p>The second issue is "capacity-building", to which training contributes. Thus, effective capacity building seeks to bring individuals and (cross-scalar) groups together to achieve clear targets through a process of experiential learning, to which training, research and information can contribute. This is embedded in the long-hook short-hook approach developed by UNDP in, for example, the South African Grasslands Project, whereby the unity and capacity of multi-stakeholder forums was built by solving issues of mining wetland reclamation/offsets, biodiversity in production forests and so on. The key to this was strong, field-level targets to which these forums were accountable, significant flexibility in achieving these targets, and the presence of effective facilitators that (1) provided scientific inputs (2) helped to keep groups together and moving forward and (3) translated on-the-ground successes into formal tools, guidelines, etc. that were then adopted at higher levels of governance.</p> <p>In the light of these comments, would the balance and effectiveness of this project not be strengthened by using landscape level interventions at high priority or demonstration field sites (i.e. component 3) to develop mechanisms for</p>	<p>Although project interventions at both systemic and field levels will be developed in parallel, the project design nevertheless takes into account a combination of a long-hook short-hook approach to strengthen intervention as proposed by STAP. Through Outcomes 1 and 2 it will work at the systemic level to strengthen the institutional stakeholders for developing the governance framework and tackling markets and supply chains for sustainable production (long-hook). Through Outcome 3 the project will work in the landscape through on the ground interventions in three priority landscapes that will help bring stakeholders together and will help to generate information and knowledge (short-hook) so that these experiences and lessons will in turn provide feedback to the multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms to continue the development and improvement of the governance framework (through the Territorial Coordination Platform with the participation of multi-level stakeholders, Outcome 1) and the market and financial frameworks (Regional platforms for sustainable supply chains). The Project Results Framework incorporates clear targets to measure the achievement of each outcome as per the proposed approach. To ensure effectiveness the project will undertake</p>

STAP comments	UNDP response
<p>incentivizing sustainable/biodiversity production (i.e. component 2), and in this way contribute to strengthened multi-level governance frameworks (i.e. component 1)?</p>	<p>approaches that take into account gender issues, ethnic differences and geographical distances of the different target groups and training/awareness raising contents will be jointly developed with MAE, the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Aquaculture and Fisheries (MAGAP) and universities of the Amazon region, which have accumulated significant experience in capacity building.</p>
<p>Specific comments</p> <p>1. Selection of the three priority landscapes will be based on criteria including 1) high conservation value, 2) biomass carbon concentration, 3) deforestation risk level, 4) stakeholder willingness, and co-funding. Is the information/data necessary for this analysis readily available at comparable scales and if so, how will it be combined to effectively determine the priority landscape “ in a GIS?</p>	<p>The selection process included the definition of 23 criteria: 1) Objective and premises of the project as stated in the PIF; 2) Presence of international cooperation; 3) Carbon contents; 4) Political affinity and level of conflicts; 5) Qualification of the Land Use and Development Plans; 6) Technical capacity of GADs for environmental management; 7) Capacity for managing international cooperation; 8) Availability of geographical information; 9) Percentage of surface area under agricultural use; 10) Presence of the Socio-Bosque Program; 11) Air access; 12) Land access; 13) River access; 14) Presence of collection centers for harvests; 15) Areas of field work by universities and research centers; 16) Presence of indigenous peoples; 17) Presence of private sector and financial institutions; 18) Deforestation rates; 19) Conservation gaps; 20) Presence of strategic projects; 21) Poverty rates; 22) Presence of protected area buffer zones and protective forests; 23) threats and vulnerability of ecosystems.</p> <p>Information and maps related to each criteria were collected and the following maps were prepared as part of the geographical analysis: 1) Carbon contents; 2) Surface area under agricultural use; 3) Presence of Socio-Bosque Program; 4) Air access; 5) Road access; 6) River access; 7) Presence of collection centers; 8) Indigenous peoples; 9) Deforestation; 10) Conservation gaps; 11) Presence of strategic projects; 12) Protected area buffer zones and protective forests; and 13) Threats and vulnerability of ecosystems.</p> <p>Scores were assigned to each criterion and three landscapes were selected (Northern, Central and Southern Amazon) based on the highest scores. Once the landscapes were validated with MAE, the maps and thematic coverage were clipped through Geographical Information Systems (GIS) and thematic and environmental maps were prepared for each landscape, namely: 1) Political-administrative division; 2) Protected Areas; 3) Protective forests; 4) Biosphere reserves; 5) RAMSAR sites; 6) Socio-Bosque conservation areas; 7) Land use; and 8) Watersheds.</p> <p>The environmental maps collected from different institutions were clipped following the boundaries of the selected landscapes in order to prepare thematic maps of each selected area. Clips of the geographical coverage were the basis to prepare the maps for each environmental component. Annex K of the GEF-UNDP Project document includes the main maps generated.</p>

STAP comments	UNDP response
<p>2. The indicators for Component 1 need to be much stronger. For example, METT focuses on management process in PAs, and is not really useful for measuring livelihoods and biodiversity outcomes in community and indigenous lands.</p>	<p>Indicators have been fine-tuned. Kindly refer to Section VI. Project Results Framework (pages 72-79) of the GEF-UNDP Project Document. We agree the METT is not the most useful tool for indigenous lands and taking this into account the project will work with MAE to develop and pilot a specific tool for the Kutuku Shaimi protective forest. This tool will serve the MAE to uptake its use for all protective forests..</p>
<p>3. At what level will output 1.3 focus, and how? <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Output 1.3 will focus mainly at municipal level (5 cantons that make up the target landscapes) given that this level has direct responsibility over land use and occupation in accordance with national legislation. The Constitution stipulates that municipalities have the exclusive responsibility for planning municipal development and preparing land use and development plans to regulate urban and rural land use and occupation and exercising its control within the canton. The Organic Code for Territorial Organization, Autonomy and Decentralization ratifies these roles and further specifies that it is municipal responsibility to control the use and occupation of the land within the territory of the canton. Furthermore, the Organic Law for Land Use Planning and Management stipulates that municipal governments shall classify municipal lands into urban and rural and will define the use and management of such lands, identifying natural and anthropogenic risks; promote environmental quality, security, social cohesion and mobility and accessibility. It also stipulates that the land use and occupation planning decisions at this level will rationalize the interventions in the territory of the other government levels.</p>
<p>4. What are "decision-making tools in support of sustainable production", "coordination mechanisms between indigenous peoples" (p2)</p>	<p>1) Decision making tools: The UNREDD Program developed an assessment of opportunity costs which provides Ecuador with a map of trajectories of opportunity costs that enables identifying the reasoning behind transitions from forest to non-forest and vice-versa through restoration processes. The map of opportunity costs provides information on productive transitions valued in terms of net carbon emissions. The Project will take advantage of this information; however it is not sufficient for land use planning, which must integrate sectorial, territorial, biophysical elements, among others. Therefore the Project will supplement this information with Targeted Scenario Analysis for each target landscape, comparing current land uses (business-as-usual) with alternative scenarios thus adding value to the UNREDD opportunity cost assessment and capturing more accurately the value of ecosystem services. The results of the UNREDD assessment and the Targeted Scenario Analysis will serve as inputs for adjustment of sectorial policies (through the improved coordination between National Citizen Sectorial Councils and ministries (Outcome 1), for developing Regional Action Plans for Sustainable Supply Chains (Outcome 2) and developing Land Use and Development Plans (Outcome 1), incorporating guidelines and specific guidance on types and production models for different categories of forest (protection, production, private) and levels of land degradation (high, medium, low).</p>

STAP comments	UNDP response
	<p>2) Coordination mechanisms between indigenous peoples' Life Plans and Land Use and Development Plans: Life Plans are planning instruments that indigenous communities develop and agree through a participatory process. It contains information, a self-assessment on the community, resources and needs; the changes the community wishes to achieve and the projects to achieve such changes and improve their livelihoods; and the community's position in regards to indigenous governance and government stakeholders and other stakeholders, as well as the community's long term political vision. As happens with other planning instruments, Life Plans lack coordination with planning instruments at different levels (e.g. Land Use and Development Plans). To contribute to resolve this problem and generate lessons the project will support selected indigenous peoples' communities to mainstream the landscape approach in their Life Plans and to articulate them with Land Use and Development Plans. Dialogue will be undertaken between government stakeholders and communities through the Citizen Assemblies to be established. Through the Citizen Assemblies the communities will be able to submit their proposals for activities foreseen in their Life Plans so that they can be incorporated into the Land Use and Development Plans.</p>
<p>5. What does 2.3 b) mean? □</p>	<p>Income distribution refers to the manner in which the incomes generated through an economic activity are distributed among the different socio-economic strata. It is independent from how the incomes are obtained and distribution is not necessarily equal given that there is an inequality in incomes. In this context, the Project will assess how income is generated and distributed in several types of activities and how incomes may be increased through the introduction of SFM and SLM best practices.</p> <p>The project will technically assist MAE and MAGAP to model income distribution systems from SFM and SLM incentives, including the REDD+ national program, through analyzing selected cases: i) sustainable forest management linked to a forest harvesting plan; ii) an NTFP management plan for a determined species; iii) agricultural and livestock best practices (based on an integral farm management plan); iv) conservation linked to a PSB investment plan; and v) conservation and restoration of the Santiago watershed (Upano River) and Pastaza watershed (Nangaritza River) and conservation of the Alto Upano Municipal Conservation Area for sustainable use of protected areas and wildlife. The project will collect income related information for each case to model the distribution of SFM and SLM incomes per frequencies or class intervals. The models will include, among others: primary income; self-consumption; self-supply; property income; current transfers, and non-current incomes. These will serve to improve coordination between current incentive programs and policies through generating a baseline of how incomes for these selected activities are distributed in the CTEA; providing</p>

STAP comments	UNDP response
	inputs to propose a better distribution of incomes to support more effective SFM and SLM practices in the CTEA; and improving monitoring systems on the distribution and use of incomes.
6. Developing micro-credit for supporting sustainable production (2.4 b.) is a big job in and of itself. □	The GEF and GCF projects will jointly work to develop this activity so that the combined resources of both projects will serve to forward this endeavor. Technical assistance will be provided to BANECUADOR to undertake a feasibility study for developing credit lines for small producers, women and youths, for adding value to NTFPs and alternative products, and develop the credit lines, including environmental criteria as part of the lending procedures and requirements. BANECUADOR will be in charge of promoting and implementing the credits with the beneficiaries. To further support these activities, the GEF project will develop a sustainable finance training program targeting small producers to build their capacities for accessing and adequately managing credits, emphasizing in women and youths.

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>21</sup>**

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

<b>PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 198,000</b>			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Project preparation grant to finalize the project Sustainable Development of the Ecuadorian Amazon: integrated management of multiple use landscapes and high value conservation forests	198,000	177,215.46	20,784.54
<b>Total</b>	<b>198,000</b>	<b>177,215.46</b>	<b>20,784.54</b>

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A

---

<sup>21</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.