



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

GEF ID:	4775		
Country/Region:	Ecuador		
Project Title:	Promotion of Climate-smart Livestock Management Integrating Reversion of Land Degradation and Reduction of Desertification Risks in Vulnerable Provinces		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Multi Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1; LD-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3; CCM-5;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,856,060
Co-financing:	\$22,156,554	Total Project Cost:	\$26,112,614
PIF Approval:	February 21, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 12, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mohamed Bakarr	Agency Contact Person:	Christina Seeberg Elverfeldt

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	13 December 2011 Yes, Ecuador is an eligible country. CCA: YES. Ecuador is a non-Annex I Party to the UNFCCC. Cleared	27 April 2015 Yes Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	13 December 2011 Yes the OFP endorsement is attached. Cleared	

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

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

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	13 December 2011 Yes. FAO has clarified its thematic experience and technical capability to implement the proposed integrated approach. This is also demonstrated by the range of planned and existing activities from which it will draw some resources as co-financing for this project. Cleared	27 April 2015 Yes, FAO's comparative advantage is well established. Cleared
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	N/a
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	13 December 2011 Yes, a list of planned and ongoing initiatives are listed that demonstrate a strong country-level engagement by the Agency. In addition, the project will leverage some of the Agency's existing in-country capacity for technical support and administrative purposes. Cleared	27 April 2015 Yes, the project still fits FAO's program and capacity in the country. Cleared
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	13 December 2011 Yes, the GEF TF resources requested are within the country's STAR allocation. Cleared	27 April 2015 Yes Cleared
	• the focal area allocation?	13 December 2011	27 April 2015

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Yes, the LD and CC resources are within the country's STAR allocation. Cleared	Yes Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	N/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	13 December 2011 CCA: YES. The proposed SCCF grant is available from the SCCF Adaptation Program (SCCF-A). Cleared	27 April 2015 Yes Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/A	N/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	13 December 2011 The project is not requesting any set-aside funds. Cleared	27 April 2015 No set-aside funds are requested. Cleared
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	13 December 2011 Yes. The project is aligned with the LD focal area results framework, with an emphasis on livestock systems. The concept of "climate-smart livestock management" is introduced, but without a clear explanation of why this is necessary as opposed to a conventional approach to improving livestock management. Please clarify and justify the need for pursuing this approach, including rationale for combining resources from multiple trust funds in the GEF.	27 April 2015 Yes, the alignment with focal areas and SCCF remains clear. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>CCA: YES</p> <p>Climate Change Mitigation (CCM): a) Expected Outcomes should use the same terms as appearing in the Reference Guide outcomes (for CCM-5) b) Output 5.1 "One GHG monitoring systems established in pilot areas" should be associated with Outcome 5.1. Also in Table A please use the exact text in the Template Reference Guide.</p> <p>09 January, 2013</p> <p>The concept of CSLM is now explained and reflects LD focal area priorities.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>13 December 2011</p> <p>For the LD focal area, the project will contribute to LD1 (agro-ecosystems), with an emphasis on livestock management.</p> <p>CCM: Yes. And it appears that the NAMA is financed from the STAR allocation of Ecuador, which is the appropriate approach.</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. According to the Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A), the proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1 and CCA-2, specifically mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks</p>	<p>27 April 2015</p> <p>Yes, all the relevant objectives are identified.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>(CCA-1.1) and the successful demonstration, deployment and transfer of relevant adaptation technology (CCA-3.1). Yet, as described in Table B and Section B.2.2 of the PIF, the proposed project would support the development of a National Climate Change Adaptation Plan (NCCAP) and a Climate-Smart Livestock Strategy (CSLS), rather than mainstreaming adaptation in existing policies and plans in relevant sectors. Moreover, the SCCF grant would support significant capacity building activities, corresponding to CCA-2.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that Table A captures the full range of CCA objectives, outcomes and outputs towards which the proposed project is expected to contribute.</p> <p>09 January, 2013</p> <p>CCA: YES. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) has been revised as recommended. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1.1, 2.2 and 3.1</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>13 December 2011</p> <p>Links to relevant country strategies and plans have been highlighted for the most part. For UNCCD, however, it is not clear whether the country has a NAP that will be supported. Please clarify</p>	<p>27 April 2015</p> <p>Yes, the consistency with national programs and plans is adequately described</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>and explain clearly how the project will address SLM priorities as they related to implementation of the UNCCD and related country plans.</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. The PIF refers mainly to Ecuador's Second National Communication (SNC), which is yet to be submitted and could hence not be accessed for this review. According to the Initial National Communication (INC), however, Ecuador suffers from the effects of droughts and floods on agriculture, particularly in the Coast and Sierra regions. While the proposed project would target these vulnerable regions, it remains unclear to what extent livestock production will be affected by climate change. According to the INC, it appears that the most urgent adaptation needs are associated with the production of food crops and livestock in the Sierra region. However, the proposal targets climate-smart livestock management in cantons that are not in Sierra region.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please elaborate on the consistency of the proposed project with Ecuador's adaptation priorities as outlined in the INC and SNC. In particular, justify the focus of the proposed adaptation measures on livestock as opposed to crop production.</p> <p>CCM: The SNC (second national communications) has not yet been</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>submitted. From the first national communications, LULUCF emissions were overall far greater than agriculture, although the methane emissions in the agriculture sector were higher than LULUCF. Please provide details on the overall trend of emissions and more specifically, data for the livestock systems, etc.</p> <p>09 January, 2013</p> <p>The re-submission now demonstrates consistency with NAP priorities and relevant data for the SNC. It also clarifies the alignment of the proposed project with the climate change impacts, vulnerabilities and adaptation measures identified in Ecuador's SNC, released in April 2012.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>13 December 2011</p> <p>No. Given the level of planned investment in individual and institutional capacity, The PIF needs to include specific details on how exactly the capacities developed will contribute to sustainability of project outcomes. Also, specifically add concise explanation on proposed 5 financing mechanisms and 5 incentive schemes.</p> <p>09 January 2013</p> <p>The re-submission is now clear on how</p>	<p>27 April 2015</p> <p>Yes, the sustainability of outcomes in relation to capacities developed is adequately described in the project document.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>capacity building will support sustainability of outcomes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Project Design	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>13 December 2011</p> <p>No. The project context is not very clear especially in relation to the extent of degradation that is associated with livestock production versus other land uses. Given the emphasis on livestock, please provide a clear assessment of the interactions between productivity trends, land degradation, and climate change relative to the human livelihoods in the targeted areas. How is the Government specifically addressing or planning to address the complex dynamics through the MAGAP, MAE, and SENAGUA? What are the underlying assumptions about the Government's approach, and how are these supported by the available data on livestock production, population, and degradation trends in the targeted areas?</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. While the PIF describes adequately the effects of past and current changes in temperatures, precipitation, and associated extreme weather events, the baseline projects require considerable clarification. The PIF describes only the Sustainable Livestock National Plan, which would provide \$2.6 million in co-financing to the proposed GEF-SCCF project. In addition, section C.1 of the PIF lists five</p>	<p>April 27 2015</p> <p>The Request for CEO Endorsement and the FAO Project Document provides a clear description of the baseline situation, including in relation to the current and expected effects of climate change. It also provides details of baseline projects and programs on which the proposed GEFTF and SCCF grant would build and that it would enhance, along with the confirmed sources, amounts and types of co-financing.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>FAO projects, through which the Agency would bring \$250,000 in co-financing. Thus, only \$2.85 million out of the total indicative co-financing of \$8.76 million is accounted for in the description of the baseline projects. Moreover, the PIF does not describe the extent to which the baseline projects would be unable to achieve sustainable results due to the effects of climate change, including variability (see also Section 9 above).</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) describe the full range of baseline initiatives on which the proposed GEF-SCCF project would build and (ii) describe the extent to which these baseline projects are vulnerable to the effects of climate change.</p> <p>CCM: There is little data presented on livestock systems associated GHG emissions and trends (and related project impact on these emissions). Please discuss this information in the text, and include relevant information from the SNC.</p> <p>09 January 2013</p> <p>The re-submission is now includes a sufficient description of the project context and baseline from the LD and CC perspectives, with sound data and assumptions.</p> <p>CCA: YES. The re-submission clarifies</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the baseline initiatives on which the proposed project would build, as well as their associated co-financing. Section B.1 of the revised PIF also describes adequately the extent to which the baseline initiatives are unable to adequately address the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>14 December 2011</p> <p>No. Overall, the PIF does not provide an adequate reasoning for the GEF increment and SCCF additionality based on the context and baseline activities as noted in #11 above. How exactly are the baseline investments being targeted to justify the GEF increment for GEBs and the SCCF additionality for adaptation? What specific transformative impacts will be achieved with the GEF increment and SCCF addition, or that will otherwise not be realized without GEF?</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. In absence of an adequate description of relevant baseline initiatives, the additional reasoning cannot be fully assessed at this stage. As described above (see Section 8), the</p>	<p>27 April 2015</p> <p>The description of both incremental reasoning for GEFTF and additional resonaning for the SCCF grant is cleared in the project documents. Appropriate justification has been provided for minor changes introduced since the PIF stage.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>proposed project appears to support the development of NCCAP and CSLS rather than mainstreaming adaptation into existing policies, strategies and plans in accordance with the principle of additional cost. Moreover, Component 1 would support considerable, stand-alone capacity building initiatives, including no less than 70 workshops for 1,860 participants. These capacity building measures do not appear to be integrated into any existing training programs or structures and they would only in part support the implementation of the concrete, on-the-ground investments proposed under Components 2 and 3.</p> <p>Under Component 2, the SCCF would support the creation of "10 financing mechanisms to stimulate the transfer of enhanced silvo-pastoral technologies for CCA". Rather than establish new financing mechanisms, the project should explore means to allow farmers to access existing sources of finance to invest in climate-resilient technologies and practices. Moreover, the SCCF would finance "communitarian micro-finances to support agro-tourism to compensate climate-related economic losses". Agro-tourism appears more relevant for baseline development initiatives and the merits of such a compensation scheme, as opposed to micro-insurance, are unclear.</p> <p>The PIF repeatedly refers to, but does</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>not define, "climate-smart livestock management", which according to FAO encompasses both adaptation and mitigation. This has lead, however, to a confusion of incremental and additional cost as Section B.2.2 maintains that the SCCF would support "technology services focused on GHG emissions reduction" and "shrubs and forages that capture CO2". Such activities are ineligible for SCCF-A financing.</p> <p>Finally, Component 3, although not requesting SCCF resources, appears to include activities that are highly relevant for adaptation, such as increased rainwater-use efficiency and the introduction of flood and drought-resistant species.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 7 and 11 above, please revisit the additional reasoning presented in Section B.2.2 of the PIF. In particular, demonstrate that the SCCF supports activities that generate adaptation benefits and that, where applicable, build on existing structures and initiatives rather than creating new ones.</p> <p>09 January 2013</p> <p>The incremental reasoning is now clear for use of GEF TF resources. Please address the concern below for SCCF.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. While the activities proposed for SCCF funding have been streamlined considerably in the re-submission, and the additional reasoning for Component 1 has been adequately clarified for this stage of project development, it is still not clear how the capacities developed and the technologies transferred through Component 2 would build on and be scaled up through MAGAP and other relevant baseline initiatives.</p> <p>February 8, 2013</p> <p>All issues have now being addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>14 December 2011</p> <p>No. The project framework is neither sound nor sufficiently clear. The project is structured around three components, six outcomes, and 21 outputs. The project framework could be streamlined considerably with fewer outputs. The framework appears repetitive, presenting different aspects of the same activities as separate outputs (e.g. outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.1; 2.3.1 and 2.3.2). Moreover, the outcomes are articulated as outputs. Finally, it is not clear why Component 2 has been described as INV, as the activities appeared more geared towards TA. Please streamline and clarify the project framework.</p>	<p>27 April 2015</p> <p>The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear. The minor adjustments from PIF are adequately justified in the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>CCM: Please clarify that the end product of the NAMA should be a suite of actions and policies to be implemented</p> <p>09 January 2013</p> <p>The overall project framework is now clear, with outcomes and outputs appropriately streamlined under the three components. There is one remaining concern related to CC-M that needs to be addressed.</p> <p>CC-M: NO. One of the proposed expected output is the national communications (Output 6.1). The current design of this project will not allow for a national communications to be completed. It is recommended that the output 6.1 relating to national communications and its associated budget be removed from the project.</p> <p>February 8, 2013</p> <p>All issues have now being addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>14 December 2011</p> <p>No. In addition to the apparent lack of clarity on why the CSLM approach is being proposed, the incremental/additional reasoning is very weak. It is therefore hard to assess whether the proposed approach is cost</p>	<p>27 April 2015</p> <p>The global environmental benefits have been clearly identified and quantified as appropriate. The expected adaptation benefits are also clearly described in the Request for CEO Endorsement and FAO Project Document.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>effective relative to others that could have also being pursued. Please provide a clear description of how the incremental/adaptation benefits can be assured.</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. Provided that the additional reasoning requires considerable clarification, the adaptation benefits of the proposed project cannot be adequately assessed at this stage. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13 above, please describe the expected adaptation benefits in Section B.2.2 of the PIF.</p> <p>CCM: a) Specifically, mitigation benefit in animal husbandry depends on the balance between CH4 emissions from livestock and CO2 captured thanks to sustainable practices. The PIF is not yet clear on how this balance will be managed to achieve GHG mitigation in the end (some actions deal with CO2 capture. Would activities also focus on CH4 emissions? Would activities look at the balance between the two and how to make it in favor of GHG reductions?). Please briefly discuss and also explain if new methodologies will need to be developed or can existing methodologies, say from VCS, be adopted?</p> <p>b) Please provide preliminary estimates of GHG benefits for these activities, briefly documented.</p>	Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>09 January 2013</p> <p>The resubmission now includes a more rigorous approach to clarifying GEBs, which is acceptable. However, it is expected that the CEO Endorsement will include clear measures of the GEBs and take into account potential tradeoffs at scale (see #31 below).</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>February 8, 2013</p> <p>All issues have now being addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>14 December 2011</p> <p>Yes. The proposed project would generate socio-economic benefits, such as poverty reduction and enhanced food security, with a particular emphasis on women. The PIF provides a clear description of potential role for beneficiaries in generating GEBs.</p> <p>CCM: However, when livelihood enhancement implies livestock development this could lead to a negative impact on the balance between CH4 emissions and CO2 sequestration. Please ensure that this concern is clarified in response to #15.</p>	<p>27 April 2015</p> <p>Yes, the socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions have been adequately described.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>14 December 2011</p> <p>Yes. The PIF includes a preliminary assessment of stakeholders to be engaged, including potential roles. It is also noted that this will be elaborated at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>27 April 2015</p> <p>Yes, public participation and and role of CSOs has been taken into consideration.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>14 December 2011</p> <p>While the PIF provides a risk matrix (Section B.4), it does not adequately describe the effects of nor appropriate mitigation measures associated with extreme drought events. Droughts would directly affect the food security and livelihoods of the project beneficiaries, rather than merely aggravating land degradation. Please elaborate on the effects of and appropriate mitigation measures associated with the risk of extreme drought events.</p> <p>09 January 2013</p> <p>The concern about drought risk has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>27 April 2015</p> <p>Yes, all relevant risks have been taken into account. And CC risks will be especially addressed through the overall project design.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>14 December 2011</p> <p>The PIF includes a list of other initiatives for coordination, but does not provide specific details on what aspects will need to be aligned to maximize opportunities for synergy and complementarity. Please provide a more clear indication of how consistency will be reflected between the proposed project and other initiatives. Specifically, for projects and initiative with similar goals or outcomes, it needs to explain the lessons learned, what the proposed project will do that has not been done already, and is not planned by the other projects and why this has not or cannot be achieved by the other projects.</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. Section B.6 of the PIF cites two climate change adaptation projects, namely the UNDP-SCCF project 'Adaptation to climate change through effective water governance' and the World Bank-SCCF project 'Adaptation to glacier retreat'. Yet, the PIF does not describe how the proposed project would complement and build on these ongoing initiatives. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe how the proposed GEF-SCCF project would complement and build on the ongoing adaptation initiatives in Ecuador.</p> <p>09 January 2013</p>	<p>27 April 2015</p> <p>Yes, and the appropriate projects for coordination have been identified and described. In addition, the Project Document describes how the proposed project would draw lessons from and build on the two completed SCCF projects 'Adaptation to climate change through effective water governance' and 'Adaptation to glacier retreat'.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Consistency and coordination with other initiatives is now adequately reflected. Cleared	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	14 December 2011 Yes, and the proposed arrangement will build on existing institutional arrangements and links between key stakeholders, including the government agencies. This will maximize efficiency and effectiveness during implementation. Cleared	27 April 2015 Yes, the institutional arrangement as described is adequate. Cleared
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		27 April 2015 Yes, the project structure is sufficiently close to what was approved, and the minor changes in response to STAP comments have helped to streamline the outcomes and outputs. Cleared
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		N/a
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	14 December 2011 No. Please adjust to 5% of the sub-total of GEF grants (i.e. 0.05 X \$3,663,258). 09 January 2013 The PMC has been adjusted, but please	27 April 2015 No, the PMC exceeds 5%. Please adjust accordingly, including breakdown between GEFTTF and SCCF. June 22, 2015

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>specify how the amount is apportioned between the GEF focal areas / TFs.</p> <p>February 8, 2013</p> <p>The PMC is now adjusted between the TFs.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>The PMC is now appropriate.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>14 December 2011</p> <p>No. While the proportional breakdown between Trust Funds is understandable, it is still not clear how the amounts will be amounts allocated relate to the outcomes and outputs. Specifically, the co-financing for component 2 does not reflect incremental reasoning for GEBs and needs to be increased. Because the GEFTF includes multi-focal objectives, please list the funding amounts by GEFTF focal area by component (CCM, LD) in Table B. Please provide indicative breakdown of TF amounts using actual amounts as opposed to percentages, and as best as possible at the outcome level.</p> <p>CCA: NOT CLEAR. Given concerns over the additional reasoning, the appropriateness of the SCCF funding per outcome cannot be adequately assessed at this stage.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing comments under Section 13 above, please adjust the SCCF funding request as appropriate.</p>	<p>27 April 2015</p> <p>Yes, the amounts are appropriate, but there are issues with the breakdown in the tables. Please address as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please separate cofinancing amounts by Trust Fund to ensure consistency between Table and Table B - Please present separate sub-totals by Trust Fund in Table A and Table B - Please provide amounts of PMC by Trust Fund <p>June 22, 2015</p> <p>Breakdown of resources across all tables has now been resolved.</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>09 January 2013</p> <p>The funding breakdown is now appropriate for components using the the GEF TF.</p> <p>For CCA: NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above on the SCCF.</p> <p>February 8, 2013</p> <p>All issues have now been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>14 December 2011</p> <p>The total indicative cofinancing level (\$8.76 million) is not adequate for such an ambitious project, considering especially that 16 per cent of the total indicative co-financing is in the form of in-kind contributions. Please consider increasing the cofinancing to a ratio of at least 1:5, including cash and in-kind contributions.</p> <p>09 January 2013</p> <p>The indicative co-financing is now appropriate, and mostly in the form of grants.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>14 December 2011</p> <p>Yes, although the amount is relatively</p>	<p>27 April 2015</p> <p>Yes, FAO will provide in-kind support</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		modest given the range of baseline activities presented as well as case made for comparative advantage. Please consider revisiting this amount at CEO endorsement., with the possibility of increasing it in light of FAO's important role. Cleared	amount to more than \$300,000. Cleared
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		27 April 2015 Yes Cleared
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		27 April 2015 Yes Cleared
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	14 December 2011 Please provide comments is applicable.	27 April 2015 STAP comments were taken onboard during project development. Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		27 April 2015 Yes, comments from Council were fully taken onboard during project development. Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>14 December 2011</p> <p>No, PIF clearance cannot be recommended. Please address all concerns raised in the PIF, including specific issues related to the focal areas and trust funds.</p> <p>For CCA: Please refer to sections 2, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, and 26. Significant elaboration is required to demonstrate that the proposed project would support effective measures to transfer relevant adaptation technologies to Ecuador's vulnerable farmers in accordance with the principle of additional cost.</p> <p>09 January 2012</p> <p>No. Please address the remaining concerns as highlighted:</p> <p>CC-M: #14 on national communication</p> <p>CCA: Please refer to sections 13, 15 and 24</p> <p>#23 - PMC breakdown</p> <p>Febryuary 8, 2013</p> <p>All issues have now being addressed. The PIF is technically cleared and may be considered for inclusion in a future</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Work Program.</p> <p>2/2013. PIF has been cleared for the April 2013 Work Program.</p>	
	<p>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>09 January 2013</p> <p>Please note the following during project development:</p> <p>1. CC-M: At CEO endorsement, it is expected that detailed estimation of the GHG emissions impact of the project will be provided, taking account of CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O emissions, along with the assumptions and methodology used for these estimations. These estimations should detail in particular the resulting balance between carbon sequestration and avoided emissions on one hand, and potential CH₄ and N₂O emission increase due to production increase on the other hand.</p> <p>2. CC-M: At CEO endorsement please clarify how the project will avoid redundancy of funding and activities between GEF funded activities and baseline funded activities, in particular concerning the potential overlap between the FAO MICCA programme.</p>	
<p>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</p>	<p>32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?</p>		<p>27 April 2015</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</p>		<p>27 April 2015</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			No, the project cannot be recommended yet. Please address issues with PMC and breakdown of GEFTF and SCCF financing in the tables. 22 June, 2015 Yes the project is now recommended for CEO Endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 14, 2011	April 27, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 09, 2013	June 22, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 08, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

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