



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\*

### THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4770		
Country/Region:	Ecuador		
Project Title:	Integrated Management of Marine and Coastal Areas of High Value for Biodiversity in Continental Ecuador		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,058,788
Co-financing:	\$12,396,654	Total Project Cost:	\$15,455,442
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Rikke Olivera

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	12/12: Yes, the country is eligible to BD.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	12/12: Yes, Marcela Aguinaga Vallejo, the GEF OFP for Ecuador has endorsed the project in a letter dated November 25, 2011 requesting a total of \$3,441,667 from the GEF.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	12/12: Yes, FAO is well in its role, assisting Ecuador in developing fisheries regulation and mangrove management. FAO has extensive experience in the sector of Ecuadorian fisheries and has developed and disseminated numerous guidelines and training activities regarding the code of conduct for responsible fisheries and good practices.	

	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	12/12: N/A.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	12/12: Yes, this project fits under the FAO national framework of Technical Assistance Priorities in Ecuador, and is fully consistent with the Rural Development and Forestry Environment Objectives. FAO has staff in-country and plans to provide project oversight through the Project Task Manager and Operation Officers. The project will be executed by the Ministry of Environment, and by Conservation International Foundation. Please clarify if the FAO staff in Ecuador have technical capacity in Marine Conservation and protected area management.  04/04: Addressed. A fisheries expert will support the implementation of the project.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	12/12: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	12/12: Yes, Ecuador has access to \$14,724 million in Biodiversity Focal Area.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	12/12: N/A.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	12/12: N/A.	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	12/12: N/A.	
	• focal area not inside?	12/12: N/A.	

Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	12/12: The project is aligned with the biodiversity results framework. The expected outcomes of the project will focus on the outcomes 1.1, 2.1, and 2.2 of the GEF-5 strategy. Please, complete the column "Expected Outputs" of table A "Focal Area Strategy Framework".  04/04: Addressed.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	12/12: Yes, the proposed project is fully in line with the GEF biodiversity objectives 1 and 2.	
	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?	12/12: The link between this project and the country's NBSAP, the National System of Protected Areas is well described. The contribution of the project to the National Plan for Good Life 2009-2013 and the Strategy Policy of the National Protected Areas System for Ecuador 2007-2016 is also mentioned.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	12/12: Even if it is implied in the expected outcomes of the proposed project, more detailed information should be provided on how the capacities developed by the project will contribute to the sustainability of the outcomes. Specify who are the different stakeholders concerned.  04/04: Addressed.	
	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?	12/12: The baseline description provides useful information on the actions and investments planned by the government and international organizations in marine and coastal management. However, it could be useful to organize this information by project component and to provide details on the current investment for the marine and coastal	

Project Design		<p>with a local and/or national impact. Finally, the rationale to create four more protected areas should be provided (for example in showing the current weaknesses of the protected areas system in ecosystem representation).</p> <p>04/04: Addressed.</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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>12/12: We understand that the project will contribute to the conservation of four marine turtle species, to the conservation of mangrove ecosystem, and will strengthen the global network of protected areas. However, more emphasis should be placed on the global benefits of protecting 15,000 hectares of coastal and marine habitats; of adopting sustainable management in 37,000 hectares of mangroves; of developing fishery administration systems for invertebrates, coastal demersal, and white fish; of creating four more protected areas. The composition of the marine ecosystem and/or the specificity of the area/species with regard to the global biodiversity could be a relevant entry point.</p> <p>04/04: Addressed at PIF stage. However, at the CEO endorsement, this chapter will have to focus only on the incremental activities requested for GEF financing. Furthermore, the recruitment of management team cannot be</p>	

	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>12/12: The framework is well developed and provides clear expected outputs, with both qualitative and quantitative elements. However, other outcomes have to be developed. Please include biodiversity status as part of the outcomes in part 1 (rate of mangrove coverage, status of marine species, coverage and integrity of habitats). The outcome 1.2 has to be more specific, in detailing the measures for biodiversity conservation. The outcome 1.3 should for example assess the number of boarding. Will the expected output 1.2.3 be clarified at the PPG stage?</p> <p>For the outcomes in part 2, the biodiversity status has to be part of the outcomes. The outcomes should assess the status of concerned fish stocks and their related species/ habitats. Another outcome should assess the biological and socio-economic status in the mangrove concessions.</p> <p>The expected output 4.1.2 would be paid for by the fees, so, please remove and adjust that budget accordingly.</p> <p>Finally, in the text, more detailed information on the implementation of the Fishery Management System has to be provided.</p> <p>04/04: As mentioned, the expected output 4.1.2 would be paid for by fees, so please remove the activity and confirm the budget adjustment. It is noted that futher information will be provided at the CEO endorsement,</p>	
--	---	---	--

		<p>outcome 1.3.</p> <p>04/17: Addressed.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>12/12: The PIF should detail how the fishery management system will be developed and will reduce the threats to biodiversity and ecosystem and generate global biodiversity benefits. The PIF should provide the rationale for focusing the fishery management system on only a few species.</p> <p>Furthermore, more information is requested on how the fishery management system and the mangrove concessions will fit under the management plan of each protected area and in the protected areas network. Please also clarify how the incorporation of the "economic valuation of the biodiversity" is integrated into these aspects of the project.</p> <p>04/04: Addressed at PIF stage.</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>12/12: a) Concerning the development of the fishery management system further information should be provided, specifying the number of fishermen concerned, the socio-economic benefits of this project for them. The gender issue should be better addressed, especially because women are key actors in part of these fisheries. Concerning the mangrove concessions, more accurate information is expected as the experience started years ago.</p> <p>04/04: Addressed. However, at the CEO endorsement, please develop indicator</p>	

		the project activities.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	12/12: Further details and examples should be provided about the local stakeholders (footnote 37). Regarding the fisheries associations, please, better explain their role and their involvement in the governance process. Futhermore, instead of involving Tuna associations, the project should involve local and artisanal fishermen's associations.  04/04: Addressed.	
	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)	12/12: Yes, information on the potential risks and on the appropriate mitigation measures has been included.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	12/13: Yes, information is provided on the coordination with related initiatives at the regional and national level and the added-value of the proposed project. However, regarding the similar objectives with the projects: GEF project 3548 "Marine and Coastal Biodiversity Conservation", and the EPS project on the consolidation of a regional network of marine protected areas; please, better clarify the distinction between the proposed project and these two others projects. Furthermore, clarify the co-financing link with the EPS project.  04/04: Addressed.	
	20. Is the project implementation/	12/13: Please clarify how the Ministry	

		<p>International Foundation will jointly implement of the project.</p> <p>04/04: Information regarding the implementation arrangement is adequate. However, please clarify the status of Conservation International Foundation in Ecuador.</p> <p>04/17: Clarification has been provided. However, with regards to the key role played by CI and its current status in the country, by the time of CEO endorsement stage, a contingency plan should be developed, in case of CI has to withdraw. This contingency would ensure that there would be no drop in co-finance and that the implementation would not be impacted in a negative way.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>12/13: Please, make sure that the project management cost is no more than 5%.</p> <p>04/04: Addressed. The project management cost is 4.9%.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	12/13: The proposed budget seems excessive considering the activities proposed and the outputs and outcomes to be delivered. Please either reduce it or provide sufficient rationale.	



		<p>Table A, there is a discrepancy between the sum of the co-financing components (US\$ 8,585,954) and the total shown (US\$ 8,610.954). Therefore please, update accordingly. Table C, the source of co-financing has to be either NGO or bilateral agency, therefore, please correct the third line of the table.</p> <p>04/17: Addressed</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>12/13: The amount of grant and the amount of in-kind have to appear in two different rows in table C. The co-financing amount of \$5.9 million is inadequate, please improve it. A large part of the activities will have a strong impact at the local and national levels and the global benefit will be minimum, thus please balance the budget between GEF and other co-financiers accordingly.</p> <p>04/04: The co-financing amount has been increased from US\$5,960,954 to 8,610,954. However, with regards to the comment made in the previous review, the ratio is still inadequate (1:2.8). Therefore, the project should seek new co-financing.</p> <p>04/17: Addressed. The co-financing amount has been increased from US\$8,610,954 to US\$12,396,654. The co-financing ratio is now 1:4,05.</p>	
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>12/13: The FAO will provide a grant to the project for an amount of \$150,000. This co-financing will represent less than 2.5% of the co-financing. The FAO should try to increase its level of co-financing.</p>	

		04/04: Addressed. FAO will provide an additional US\$ 100,000, in-kind.  04/17: FAO will bring US\$100,000 in-kind, and US\$150,000 in grant.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	12/12  Respond as appropriate.	
	• Convention Secretariat?	12/12  Respond as appropriate.	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	12/12  Respond as appropriate.	
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	12/13: No, please, address the comments raised above.  04/04: Until the cofinancing is increased, the project will not be recommended for CEO approval. Second, please address the remaining issues raised in the review sheet.  04/17: The remaining issues have been addressed. The PIF is recommended for CEO clearance with the request that a contingency plan be developed by the time of CEO endorsement if CI has	

		question 20 above.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	04/04+04/17: Please, ensure that the following issues are addressed at the Request for CEO Endorsement: - Contingency plan on implementation arrangement - Clear and measurable outputs and outcomes are defined - Co-financing is increased and confirmed - Details on investments using the GEF funding are provided - Implementation arrangements with partners and local authorities are well set-up - GEF TT are included - Strong evidence of Global Environmental Benefits and GEF incremental value is presented	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 13, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 04, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 17, 2012	
	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	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	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.