



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

GEF ID:	9369		
Country/Region:	Ecuador		
Project Title:	Implementation of the Strategic Plan of Ecuador Mainland Marine and Coastal Protected Areas Network		
GEF Agency:	CI	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; LD-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$5,813,303
Co-financing:	\$33,739,690	Total Project Cost:	\$39,702,993
PIF Approval:	March 15, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	April 19, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Daniela Carrion

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>January 19, 2016</p> <p>PIF fails to address this as the PIF draft has cut out some of the text of the PIF format for GEF-6 which specifically asks for links with the GEF focal area strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project including the articulation of contributions to the Aichi Targets. Please revise accordingly.</p>	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		January 27, 2016 Cleared.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	January 19, 2016 Yes, but please refer to revised NBSAP given that the one referenced is 16 years old. Even a reference to importance of the project's focus in a draft version is preferable. January 27, 2016 Cleared.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	January 19, 2016 Yes, this is adequate.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	January 19, 2016 Yes, adequate reflection of incremental reasoning and how GEF investment builds on the baseline.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	January 19, 2016 Yes, but please provide more details on the sustainable finance strategy for the MPAs, identifying the current known gap at this point and the proposed gap reduction the project	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		estimates to achieve. January 27, 2016 Cleared.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	January 19, 2016 Yes, adequate at PIF stage for the most part; however, please elaborate the socio-economic aspects more thoroughly particularly with regards to the interaction and trade-offs that will have to be negotiated between those responsible for improving protection through better managed MPAs (control, enforcement, and surveillance) and the interests of the tourism and fisheries sectors and associated trade-offs between these different stakeholder groups. The PIF is more or less silent on this issue. Please embellish and strengthen in a revised PIF. January 27, 2016 Cleared.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	January 19, 2016 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	January 19, 2016	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	January 19, 2016 NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	January 19, 2016 NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	January 19, 2016 NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	January 19, 2016 No please revise and resubmit per issues raised above. January 27, 2016 The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review	January 19, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 26, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	October 31, 2017 Cleared.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	October 31, 2017 Cleared.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	October 31, 2017 Cleared.	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	October 31, 2017 Cleared.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	October 31, 2017 Cleared.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	October 31, 2017 Cleared.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	October 31, 2017 NA.	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	October 31, 2017 Cleared.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	October 31, 2017 Cleared.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	October 31, 2017 Cleared.	

Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 	October 31, 2017	Adequate responses provided to comments provided by GEFSEC. Cleared.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 	October 31, 2017	NA.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	October 31, 2017	Comprehensive responses provided to comments from Council. Cleared.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	October 31, 2017	<p>No.</p> <p>Some minor issues remain.</p> <p>First, please include OFP endorsement letter.</p> <p>Second, please select financing type for Table B in the CEO endorsement request.</p> <p>Third, Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview GEF Project Grants / Fees differ.</p> <p>Please make the necessary corrections and resubmit.</p> <p>November 2, 2017</p>

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

		Yes.	
Review Date	Review	October 31, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	November 02, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		