



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4375		
Country/Region:	Ecuador		
Project Title:	Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Ecuador		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4518 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; CD-2; CD-5; IW-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,398,145
Co-financing:	\$4,800,000	Total Project Cost:	\$9,198,145
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	March 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Danielius Pivoriunas	Agency Contact Person:	Nick Remple

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?	Yes, Ecuador is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared 9/24/2010	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A Cleared 9/24/2010	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	No. Please provide endorsement using appropriate format that is available on the GEF web site. 9/24/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, UNDP has been the implementing agency for the SGP in Ecuador for 16 years and therefore has build substantial capacity to implement the project. Cleared 9/24/2010	
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes, co-financing is within agreed limits and with good indication of higher than 1:1. Cleared 9/24/2010	

*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 9-8-2010

	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	BD: Yes, the project is clearly aligned with and should contribute to outcome 5 of strategic component three of the UNDAF and output three. In addition, the sustainable development cluster has more than 10 years experience in GEF project design and implementation. Please clarify how many staff compose the cluster and the required qualifications of the staff members in the thematic areas of the project: agriculture, tourism, forestry, biodiversity and land-use planning, and economics. Please provide details of project implementation arrangements in the country (staff, who will review and approve projects and etc). Additional information is requested 9/24/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, resources are available. Cleared 9/24/2010	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes. Cleared 9/24/2010	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• focal area set-aside?	No. Cleared 9/24/2010	
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	Yes, project is clearly aligned with outcome 2.1 and outputs 2.2 and 2.3. However, it is not clear why capacity development indicators are not identified in the table A of the PIF document. It also seems that amount allocated for capacity development is slightly overestimated comparing with other objectives. Please provide additional information and review estimated costs. 9/24/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	Yes, project is aligned with objective two of the biodiversity strategy. However, it	

		has to be aligned also to capacity development objectives. The SGP by it's nature is also multifocal activity, as it was agreed that up to 20% could be allocated to other none STAR eligible focal areas. Please reconsider the approach presented. 9/24/2010 Reconsidered and relevant changes have been made. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	BD: Please be more specific on the links between the proposed project and the NBSAP. Include references to the prioritized geographies of the project intervention. 9/24/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?	BD: No, this articulation is lacking in the proposal even though the proposal notes that global environmental benefits will be achieved through overcoming "individual and organizational capacity barriers". Please clarify how project outcomes will be sustained at the smallholder and the individual resource-user level and how civil society organizations will be enabled to foster sustainability of outcomes post-investment. It is also not clear why SGP has to provide trainings on environmental law, socio-environmental conflicts and etc. Please provide additional clarification. 9/24/2010 Clarification is provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	BD: Expansive description of the baseline environmental conditions of the three areas of intervention (Paramo, dry forest and mangroves, and Amazon rainforest) is provided. However, there is little discussion of project investments in these areas even though the GEF, and likely other donors, have made significant investments in these ecosystems. Please discuss GEF investments in each of these ecosystems. (for example, the GEF has a number of investments in the Paramo including a	

Project Design		full-size project in Chimborazo). Please also provide more details for baseline on capacity development and what needs to be achieved. 9/24/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	BD: Yes, the problem is comprehensively elucidated. However, more details about capacity development needs should be provided including data analysis. 9/24/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	BD: Yes, the project framework provides a clear and logical picture of the intervention strategy, with clear outcomes and outputs. However, implementation details are not provided. Please provide. It is also not clear how visibility of GEF funding will be ensured. 9/24/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?	BD: Yes, the incremental activities are appropriate to address the identified problem, however, please revise the argumentation on the incremental reasoning to be more specific once a more detailed description of the baseline investments are provided for the geographic areas of focus. Further details must be provided also for capacity development. 9/24/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?	BD: Yes, the methodology and assumptions informing the description of the global environmental benefits appears sound. Cleared 9/24/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?	No, this has not been demonstrated clearly within the project design, although it is implied in the various sections of the proposal. Within the project approach, please address this more clearly particularly vis a vis the problems that the project seeks to address regarding unsustainable resource use and the responses proposed. 9/24/2010	

		Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/ adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	Not provided, please provide. 9/24/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	BD: Yes, the project beneficiaries are civil society and their roles are central to the project's design and implementation and clearly described. Cleared 9/27/2010	
	20. 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)	BD: Yes, for the most part the project identifies the potential risks, however, please provide a risk rating and a clearer and more specific set of mitigation measures for each risk identified in a revised submission. In addition, the project assumes market demand for a myriad of products and access to existing markets, but there is a great risk that these markets will not materialize in the way assumed within the current project design nor will gaining access to existing markets be easy and without risk. Please discuss this risk and the project mitigation measures to address it. Please provide further clarification. 9/27/2010 Clarification is provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?	BD: Yes for the most part, but please address missing aspects of the proposal as stipulated in other comments. Please also provide details on planned implementation arrangements. 9/28/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	BD: Yes, key stakeholders are identified and roles indicated. However, further details on NSC and other implementation arrangements allocating roles of different stakeholders have to be provided. 9/27/2010 Provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	

	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	BD: Some key initiatives are identified and plans for coordination are indicated. However, as noted above, other GEF investments have not been identified, particularly in the Paramo, thus please revise this section and include these initiatives and identify plans for coordination. In addition, with regards to the full-size GEF project on the financial sustainability of the PA system, please provide more details on how the SGP will "create alliances and synergies" with this project and how coordination is envisaged. Please provide additional information. 9/27/2010 Additional information is provided. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	BD: Yes, it builds on the extensive experience of the SGP in the country. However, further details have to be provided, in terms of implementation at national level. 9/27/2010 Provided. Please provide full details on M&E costs during endorsement stage. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes appropriate. Cleared 9/27/2010	
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?	Yes, appropriate. Cleared 9/27/2010	
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if	Not confirmed but not required. However, it is not clear why there is no UNDP co-financing provided. Please provide	

	cofinancing is confirmed.	clarification. 9/27/2010 cofinancing is provided including further details on other cofinancing. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, adequate. Cleared 9/27/2010	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	Not provided, please provide a framework for tracking tools to be used. 9/27/2010 Provided. Full details to be provided during endorsement stage. Cleared 02/08/2011	
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	No, additional clarification is requested. 9/28/2010 PIF is recommended for CEO clearance. 02/08/2011	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 27, 2010	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 09, 2011	
	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.