



PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)

for the project:

Safeguarding biodiversity in the Galapagos Islands by enhancing biosecurity and creating the enabling environment for the restoration of Galapagos Island ecosystems

FY20

July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020

Executing Partners



| Project Information | | | |
|---|--|---|-------------------|
| Project Title: | Safeguarding biodiversity in the Galapagos Islands by enhancing biosecurity and creating the enabling environment for the restoration of Galapagos Island ecosystems | | |
| Country(ies): | Ecuador | GEF ID: | 9282 |
| GEF Agency(ies): | Conservation International | Duration In Months: | 30 |
| Executing Agency(ies): | Island Conservation | Actual Implementation Start Date: | February 15, 2019 |
| GEF Focal Area(s): | Biodiversity | Expected Project Completion Date: | October 31, 2021 |
| GEF Grant Amount: | \$3,301,472 | Expected Financial Closure Date: | April 30, 2022 |
| Expected Co-financing: | \$18,395,000 | Date of Last Steering Committee Meeting: | May 27, 2020 |
| Co-financing Realized as of June 30, 2020: | \$3,921,000 | Mid-Term Review-Planned Date: | June 30, 2020 |
| Date of First Disbursement: | February 15, 2019 | Mid-Term Review-Actual Date: | TBD |
| Cumulative disbursement as of June 30, 2020: | \$1,302,988 | Terminal Evaluation-Planned Date: | August 30, 2021 |
| PIR Prepared by: | Ulf Torsten Hardter | Terminal Evaluation-Actual Date: | TBD |
| CI-GEF Project Manager: | Daniela Carrión | CI-GEF Finance Lead: | Susana Escudero |

The CI-GEF Project Agency Project Implementation Report (PIR) is composed of six sections:

- Section I:** **Project Implementation Progress Status Summary:** provides a brief summary of the project as well as the implementation status and rating of the previous and current fiscal years;
- Section II:** **Project Results Implementation Progress Status and Rating:** describes the progress made towards achieving the project objective and outcomes, the implementation rating of the project, as well as recommendations to improve the project performance, when needed;
- Section III:** **Project Risks Status and Rating:** describes the progress made towards managing and mitigating project risks, the project risks mitigation rating reassessment as needed, as well as recommendations to improve the management of project risks;
- Section IV:** **Project Environmental and Social Safeguards Implementation Status and Rating:** describes the progress made towards complying with the Environmental & Social Safeguards and the Plans prepared during the PPG phase, the safeguard plans implementation rating, as well as recommendations to improve the project safeguards;
- Section V:** **Project Implementation Experiences and Lessons Learned:** describes the experiences learned by the project managers and the lessons learned through the process of implementing the project; and

SECTION I: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS SUMMARY

PROJECT SUMMARY

Invasive alien species are one of the most significant drivers of environmental degradation and species extinction worldwide, and are generally considered the primary cause of biodiversity loss in island ecosystems. When invasive rodents feed on giant tortoise eggs and hatchlings they reduce the number of tortoises available to spread seeds and 'plant' the next generation of native trees and shrubs. As canopy cover declines, so do the populations of understory plants that require shading from the harsh tropical sun. The loss of understory vegetation makes landscapes more vulnerable to soil erosion and contributes to declines in soil fertility through mineral leaching. This impairs soil fertility and undermines the capacity of landscapes to be resilient to further perturbations (e.g., extreme weather events, climate change).

The objective of the project is 'to safeguard biodiversity in the Galapagos Islands by enhancing biosecurity and creating the enabling environment for the restoration of Galapagos Island ecosystems. This project aims to safeguard biodiversity in the Galapagos Islands by: 1) enhancing biosecurity across the Galapagos archipelago, 2) solidifying the social license and infrastructure to eradicate invasive vertebrate species from Floreana Island, and 3) translocating a previously extirpated keystone species (giant tortoises) to Santa Fe Island. The project will be carried out through three components:

Component 1: Furthering development of a state-of-the-art biosecurity system.

Component 2: Solidifying the social license and infrastructure for the protection and recovery of Floreana Island ecosystems.

Component 3: Advancing the recovery of island ecosystems following invasive species eradication through the re-establishment of keystone species (i.e. giant tortoises).

Project success will secondarily lead to a reduction in land degradation, and improve ecotourism opportunities. Consequently, ecosystem services, agricultural production, and economic investments will be better secured on human-inhabited islands in Ecuador and beyond.

PRIOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS

NA. – First PIR of project.

CURRENT PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION STATUS (FY20)

The project started the implementation phase in February 2019. During the past year and a half, we achieved substantial progress towards a comprehensive strategy for ecosystem restoration in the Galapagos Islands. The project made significant progress in all three components including the related safeguard plans. A significant effort was made to start the project on a solid base and in good cooperation with the project partners. In component 1 we accomplished a systematic assessment of the Biosecurity Inspection and Control System and its control points as a solid starting point for all following outputs and related activities of component 1, and the results were handed over to the Galapagos Biosecurity Agency (ABG) for review and definition of the scope of the Action Plan. The assessment included all potential stakeholders that the biosecurity system deals with in aerial and maritime transportation. The assessment revealed significant insights into biosecurity challenges related to the two main transportation systems that connect Galapagos with the mainland and that represent the major routes for the intended or unintended introduction of potential invasive alien species. The findings will allow focusing the action plan on increasing the efficiency of inspection and control of maritime freight and will investigate additional means of interception as well as the feasibility of quarantine prior to departure measures in the maritime freight system. COVID 19 had a significant impact on this outcome because decision-making processes related to the activities of this outcome were significantly protracted and contributed to a considerably slower progress than initially planned.

In component 2 the project achieved the construction of 3 chicken coops including the preparation of budget plans, blueprints and construction guidelines, the procurement of construction materials for the construction of all eight planned chicken coops including shipping to Floreana and the procurement of the construction services until the activity was put on hold due to the epidemic. In addition, we achieved sizable progress with the development of the updated operational plan and the risk management plan package for eradication of rodents until both processes were slowed down and almost came to a hold due to the COVID 19 epidemic. The development of both plans includes a high degree of stakeholder engagement and their continuous discussion with all households and farm owners is key to a gender sensitive development of a social license for the Floreana

Restoration project. Most activities related to this outcome are delayed due to COVID 19 related restrictions, especially the suspension of interisland travel and the obligation to quarantine for 2 weeks upon arrival on Floreana.

In component 3, the Giant Tortoise Restoration Initiative in cooperation with the National Park accomplished the translocation of 155 juvenile giant tortoises from the Santa Cruz breeding center to Santa Fe Island. In addition, 31 sub adult tortoises were translocated from Espanola to Santa Cruz in order to accomplish the quarantine procedures established in the environmental management plan before they were shipped to Santa Fe. The project also achieved significant progress towards increasing the capacity of the Giant Tortoise Breeding Program. A field team of Park rangers and scientists located 29 adult giant tortoises with partial lineage of the Floreana Giant Tortoise on Wolf Volcano during a 10-day expedition and transferred them to Santa Cruz where they joined the breeding program. The activities related to this component required major logistics that involved a helicopter and the DPNG's ship Sierra Negra. This component was not significantly affected by the pandemic.

Overall, the restrictions related to the COVID 19 epidemic have significantly affected the project's overall progress. In general, the restrictions put in place to contain the epidemic had a significant impact on Components 1 and 2 whereas Component 3 was not considerably affected. The project expects to get back on track in FY21 by implementing adaptive measures such as:

- Continuous revision and adaptation of annual workplan and budget
- Application of adaptive management measures
- Preparing of procurement packages in advance during contagious phase
- Procurement of goods and services from local suppliers where possible and appropriate considering the project is on islands with strict travel restrictions

As well as returning to the planned activities once the COVID 19 restrictions are relaxed or lifted. However, the pandemic continues to be a risk to project progress.

SUMMARY: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS

| PROJECT PART | PRIOR FY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING | CURRENT FY20 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING ¹ | RATING TREND ² |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| OBJECTIVE | NA | S | NA |
| COMPONENTS AND OUTCOMES | NA | S | NA |
| ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS | NA | HS | NA |

PROJECT RISK RATING³

| | | | |
|-------|----|---|----|
| RISKS | NA | M | NA |
|-------|----|---|----|

¹ **Implementation Progress (IP) Rating:** Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more details about IP rating, please see the Appendix I of this report

² **Rating trend:** Improving, Unchanged, or Decreasing

³ **Risk Rating:** Low (L), Moderate (M), Substantial (S), High (H)

SECTION II: PROJECT RESULTS IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS STATUS AND RATING

This section describes the progress made towards achieving the project objective and outcomes, the implementation progress rating of the project, as well as recommendations to improve the project performance. This section is composed four parts:

- Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Objective: this section measures the likelihood of achieving the objective of the project
- Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Outcomes (by project component)
- Overall Project Results Progress Rating, and
- Recommendations for improvement

a. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Objective:

This section of the report assesses the progress in achieving the objective of the project.

| PROJECT OBJECTIVE: | To safeguard biodiversity in the Galapagos Islands by enhancing biosecurity and creating the enabling environment for the restoration of Galapagos Island ecosystems | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|--|
| OBJECTIVE INDICATORS | END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS | PROGRESS RATING ⁴ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION |
| Indicator a: Each stage of a comprehensive strategy of ecosystem restoration—including enhanced biosecurity, social license for eradication of alien species and the subsequent reintroduction of an endemic species—has been carefully demonstrated, monitored and evaluated, thereby: (i) achieving a state of readiness for future eradication and restoration activities on Floreana Island, and (ii) creating a model process for replication on other key islands in the Galapagos Archipelago | Enabling conditions for enhanced biosecurity, social license for eradication and the subsequent reintroduction of an endemic species have been implemented. The translocation of giant tortoises to Santa Fe Island represents the last stage of an island restoration process and provides valuable information for replicating the process on other islands. | IS | <p>A systematic assessment of the inspection and control section of the Biosecurity System has been accomplished. The assessment is the foundation for all other activities to further the development of a state of the art Biosecurity System.</p> <p>Risk management plans and the operational plan for eradication of rodents have been developed in conjunction with the community applying stakeholder engagement and gender mainstreaming. The plans will be included in the ESIA.</p> <p>The rebreeding program for the Floreana Giant Tortoise <i>Chelonoidis niger</i> has experienced a significant boost in its capacity by adding 29 adult tortoises - These individuals exhibit partial lineage of the extinct Floreana Giant Tortoise that were identified and translocated to the Giant Tortoise Breeding Center on Santa Cruz during an extensive expedition to Wolf Volcano.</p> |

⁴ O= Overdue; D= Delayed; NS= Not started on schedule; IS= Under implementation on schedule; and CA= Completed/Achieved

| OBJECTIVE INDICATORS | END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS | PROGRESS RATING ⁴ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION |
|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | | <p>The restrictions related to the COVID 19 epidemic have significantly affected the project's overall progress. As explained hereinafter, not all components and outcomes were affected to the same degree. In general, the restrictions put in place to contain the epidemic had a significant impact on Components 1 and 2 whereas Component 3 was not considerably affected. The project is located on islands with highly sensitive social and economic settings. Travel restrictions, interisland and to the mainland, are the biggest challenges the project has to deal with. The project expects to get back on track in FY21 by implementing adaptive measures among others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preparing of procurement packages in advance during contagious phase - Procurement of goods and services from local suppliers where possible and appropriate <p>The project expects to return to the planned activities once the COVID 19 restrictions are relaxed or lifted. However, the pandemic continues to be a risk to project progress.</p> |
| | | | |

| OBJECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING | JUSTIFICATION |
|---|--|
| S | A Satisfactory rating has been given to objective implementation progress. The project has been under implementation for a year and six months. During this time good progress was made in completing the enabling conditions needed to achieve a state of readiness for future eradication and restoration activities in the Floreana Island. Although there are still actions to be completed, the project is on track to achieve the project objective. Some delays are faced due to COVID-19 and associated restrictions, but the project is confident that it will get back on track in FY21. |

b. Progress towards Achieving Project Expected Outcomes (by project component).

This part of the report assesses the progress towards achieving the outcomes of the project.

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| COMPONENT 1 | Furthering development of a state-of-the-art biosecurity system |
|--------------------|---|

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Outcome 1.1: | The number of invasive alien species entering the Galapagos archipelago is substantially reduced |
|---------------------|--|

| OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS | END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET | END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS | PROGRESS RATING ⁵ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION |
|--|---|--|------------------------------|--|
| Outcome indicator 1.1: Number of invasive alien species intercepted at control points | A >5% increase from baseline in the number of pest interceptions and subsequent confiscations of goods due to pest risk across all ports combined | In 2019, 4705 confiscations were made across all categories of pest-risk goods at all ports. In 2014 (baseline), 7034 confiscation were made (see comments/justification) | IS | <p>Component 1 is a set of successive outputs and actions that all build on a systematic assessment of the Biosecurity Inspection and Control System and its control points. A detailed assessment was accomplished by the biosecurity specialist and the results were handed over to the ABG for review and definition of the scope of the Action Plan. It is important to know that the Biosecurity Inspection and Control deals principally with two major transportation systems that represent potential vehicles and routes of introduction for invasive alien species:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Air travel, 330.00 passengers and 7,200 tons of cargo per year, between Quito, Guayaquil, Santa Cruz (70%) and San Cristobal (30%) 2. Maritime freight (80,000 tons per year) between Guayaquil, Santa Cruz (69%), San Cristobal (29.5%), Isabela and Floreana (1.5%) <p>The baseline for the End of Project Indicator Target states that ABG made a total of 5054 confiscations at all control and inspection points together in 2018. Nevertheless, the number of confiscations is continuously decreasing since 2015 and in 2019 a total of 4705 confiscations were realized. According to ABG this is due to a learning effect among the customers of the transportation systems. This means that the End of Project Indicator Target will not be met particularly considering the reduced transport traffic and tourism as a result of the COVID 19 epidemic.</p> <p>In addition, there are vast differences regarding the number of confiscations and means of transportation: Air travel (77%), maritime freight (14%) and interisland passengers (7%).</p> |

⁵ ⁵ **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

| OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS | END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET | END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS | PROGRESS RATING ⁵ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>This leads to the conclusion that the End of Project Indicator Target is mainly representative for Air Travel Biosecurity and it should be considered to modify or complement it in order to increase its significance for the Outcome Indicator.</p> <p>Based on this experience, the project team suggests changing the target to: A >5% decrease from baseline in the number of pest interceptions and subsequent confiscations of goods due to pest risk across all ports combined.</p> <p>For the Action Plan and subsequent activities this leads to the following conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The inspection system implemented for air travel is working satisfyingly and needs little improvement. Confiscated products represent in their vast majority small amounts of restricted or unregistered organic products - The inspection system implemented for maritime freight realized only 694 confiscations for a total amount of 80,000 tons of maritime freight (about 16,000 truckloads) - The maritime freight system represents by far the highest likelihood for the intended or unintended introduction of invasive alien species but, as our assessment of the system in situ proved, its biosecurity system is by far not up to the task - It is more than obvious that inspection and control cannot represent the only means to intercept potential invasive alien species in maritime transportation - The action plan will therefore focus on increasing the efficiency of inspection and control of maritime freight and will investigate additional means of interception as well as the feasibility of quarantine prior to departure measures in the maritime freight system <p>The subsequent activities to automate the inspection system of sea cargo and air travel baggage by generating a barcode tag at inspection will therefore focus on the inspection and control of the maritime freight system. COVID 19 had a significant impact on this outcome so far. ABG was heavily involved in local containment measures and decision-making processes related to the components of this outcome were significantly protracted. In addition, remote working from home of IC staff and project</p> |

| OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS | END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET | END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS | PROGRESS RATING ⁵ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | | | partners, social distancing, curfew and limited coverage and capacity of means of communication contributed to a considerably slower progress of this outcome than initially planned. That said, since local restrictions were partly lifted the execution of activities related to this outcome have considerably gained momentum. |

| COMPONENT 1 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING | JUSTIFICATION | RATING TREND |
|--|--|--------------|
| S | A Satisfactory rating has been given to this component. Significant delays are seen in this component due to COVID 19. However, restrictions have been lifted and the work planned is starting again in close collaboration with Galapagos Biosecurity Agency. | NA |

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| COMPONENT 2 | Solidifying the social pathway for the protection and recovery of Floreana Island ecosystems |
|--------------------|--|

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Outcome 2.1: | The social license is established for the protection and recovery of Floreana Island ecosystems |
|---------------------|---|

| OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS | END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET | END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS | PROGRESS RATING ⁶ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION |
|---|---|--|------------------------------|---|
| Outcome indicator 2.1: The % of residents of Floreana Island who take action for the protection and recovery of Floreana Island ecosystems | At least 80% of Floreana Island residents take new or improved ecologically sustainable action in areas such as: agriculture, waste management and other areas to be defined in the Floreana Parish Council Declaration | About 75% of Floreana Island residents are applying sustainable waste management practices About 40% of farmers are taking new or improved ecologically sustainable action related to sustainable chicken, pig and cattle farming | IS | This outcome focuses on strengthening sustainable farming as part of a more comprehensive strategy towards a sustainable development framework. GEF funds are supporting the transformation of chicken raising, while co-financing is supporting work related to sustainable pig and cattle facilities, with a number of benefits related to the planned eradication work and beyond. This outcome deals with the construction of 8 additional chicken coops that will house chickens during the eradication phase, improve poultry production and avoid farmer – wildlife conflict with short – eared owls and hawks. Together with the seven chicken coops previously constructed by IC, 15 of 17 farms on Floreana will transform their chicken production. So far, we accomplished the preparation of budget plans, blueprints and construction guidelines, the procurement of construction materials including shipping to Floreana and the procurement of the construction services. So far, 3 chicken coops have been constructed. The construction was put on hold due to COVID 19 related interisland travel restrictions. The construction of the remaining 5 chicken coops will be resumed as soon as interisland travel restrictions will be lifted. Technically this activity is delayed but the delay will not influence the outcome of this component since there are no other activities that depend on the accomplishment of this outcome. |
| Outcome indicator 2.2.: The level of participation and support from Floreana Island residents and strategic project partners for the plans to eradicate invasive rodents and feral cats, and for the concept of reintroduction of endemic species previously | 100% of Floreana Island residents and strategic project partners participate and demonstrate support for the plans to eradicate rodents and feral cats, and for the | About 70% of Floreana Island residents and strategic project partners participate and demonstrate support for the plans to eradicate rodents and feral cats and for the | IS | This outcome deals with the preparation, community and project partner input and approval of the Floreana Parish Council Declaration, the operational plan package and the risk management plans. So far, the focus has been on the operational plan package and the risk management plans. A first draft of the operational plan package was prepared and reviewed by IC staff in cooperation with DPNG and ABG. An updated version is being prepared that includes technical inputs from DPNG and ABG as well as state of the art technology, e.g. the use of drones instead of helicopters. Although this activity is much advanced, it was finally put on hold due to COVID 19 related delays regarding proposals from drone providers. |

⁶ ⁶ **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

| OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS | END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET | END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS | PROGRESS RATING ⁶ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION |
|--------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|---|
| extirpated by invasive species | concept of reintroduction of endemic species previously extirpated by invasive species | concept of reintroduction of endemic species | | <p>Once the updated package is finished, it will be translated into Spanish and will be presented and discussed with allies and relevant stakeholders before it will be submitted for PSC approval.</p> <p>The first set of risk management plans for livestock, pets, freshwater, children, livestock, nearshore fisheries, commensal rodents, and tourism was drafted by IC staff in cooperation with project partners and the Floreana Community.</p> <p>The set of risk management plans was also reviewed by DPNG and ABG. Individual plans were also presented to potential stakeholders, e.g. to official representatives of Ministry for Agriculture, Ministry for Tourism, Ministry for Public Health, etc. The reviewed and updated package was being discussed again with representatives of the Floreana community and households. A special consultation meeting with 20 members of the community representing all public institutions in Floreana was organized to discuss the water management plan.</p> <p>Until April, a total of 54 meetings were held with stakeholders, representatives of the Floreana community, and household members to discuss operational and management plans and their relation to the respective property and household.</p> <p>The set of risk management plans was edited and put in a standardized format by IC's Restoration Specialist and then sent to partner institutions for final review and feedback, e.g. Ministry for Agriculture, Ministry for Tourism, etc. Since most of these partner institutions are heavily involved in activities related to responses of the public sector to COVID 19, this process takes significantly longer than initially expected.</p> <p>IC's Floreana Project Team also discussed the package with representatives of the Floreana community and residents representing individual households.</p> <p>In addition, IC has developed a data collection tool, that captures and organizes all the information necessary to identify the potential risk and mitigation measures to be implemented on each individual property of Floreana Island. The tool also records and summarizes data and information gathered during the consultation process.</p> <p>Most activities related to this outcome are delayed due to COVID 19 related restrictions. Since the middle of March, all interisland travel was suspended. In addition, the Floreana Community Council decided that all potential visitors to Floreana would have to quarantine for 2 weeks once</p> |

| OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS | END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET | END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS | PROGRESS RATING ⁶ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| | | | | they get on the island. Activities will be resumed once the restrictions are lifted |

| COMPONENT 2 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING | JUSTIFICATION | RATING TREND |
|--|---|--------------|
| S | A Satisfactory rating has been given to component 2. The project has progressed in implementing both outcomes under this component. COVID has delayed the activities in Floreana. However, those will continue in the coming months when restrictions in the islands are lifted. Despite this, over 70% of progress is reported after a year and a half under implementation, which is a good for being in mid-term of the implementation period. | NA |

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| COMPONENT 3 | Advancing the recovery of island ecosystems following invasive species eradication through the establishment of keystone species (i.e. giant tortoises) |
|--------------------|---|

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| Outcome 3.1: | Ecosystem processes, particularly seed dispersal, re-initiated across Santa Fe island (2,413 ha) as the result of the translocation of giant tortoises |
| Outcome 3.2: | Production in captivity of giant tortoises for future translocation throughout the archipelago is significantly increased along with associated capacities |

| OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS | END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET | END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS | PROGRESS RATING ⁷ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION |
|--|--|---|------------------------------|---|
| Outcome indicator 3.1: Percentage of Santa Fe Island land area where giant tortoises are dispersing seeds | At least 506 giant tortoises of the species <i>Chelonoidis hoodensis</i> are dispersing seeds on approximately 50% (1,206 ha) of the area of Santa Fe Island | There are 582 giant tortoises of the species <i>Chelonoidis hoodensis</i> dispersing seeds on Santa Fe Island | IS | This outcome deals with the establishment of a giant tortoise population of <i>Chelonoidis hoodensis</i> tortoises as ecosystem engineers on Santa Fe. 155 juvenile tortoises from the Santa Cruz breeding center were translocated to Santa Fe Island by the Giant Tortoise Restoration Initiative and the DPNG. All juvenile tortoises were between four and five years old on the day of their release into the wild. All tortoises were equipped with subdermal microchips (transponders) to enable individual identification. In addition, as a result of a trip to Espanola Island, 31 sub-adult tortoises of the species <i>Chelonoidis hoodensis</i> were identified and moved from Espanola to the Giant Tortoise Breeding Center on Santa Cruz for quarantine purposes. The sub-adult tortoises were between 18 and 20 years old. The activity involved the DPNG's ship Sierra Negra and the contracted helicopter. |

⁷ **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

| OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS | END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET | END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS | PROGRESS RATING ⁷ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION |
|--|--|--|------------------------------|---|
| | | | | <p>All 31 sub-adult tortoises underwent a strict quarantine protocol for several months at the Giant Tortoise Breeding Center in order to make sure that all seeds from Espanola Island were removed from their digestive system. The tortoises were then prepared for their trip to Santa Fe Island. The activity was realized in December during a joint field trip between the DPNG and GC/Giant Tortoise Restoration Initiative involving the DPNG's ship Sierra Negra and the contracted helicopter.</p> <p>All tortoises released on Santa Fe were equipped with microchips that will allow their individual identification during long-term population monitoring. In addition, 46 fenced control areas and 182 sample points were established in order to monitor ecological changes associated with the tortoise translocation on Santa Fe</p> <p>This outcome is not affected by COVID 19 related restrictions so far</p> |
| <p>Outcome indicator 3.2: Number of giant tortoises raised in captivity annually – Santa Cruz Number of giant tortoises raised in captivity annually – Isabela</p> | <p>In the breeding centers, an enhanced and expanded breeding stock contributes to the following numbers of giant tortoises reaching the age of one year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Santa Cruz, at least 400 tortoises annually from the populations of Española, Santiago, Floreana, Pinzón and Eastern Santa Cruz In Isabela, an average of 300 tortoises annually | <p>During this breeding season, a total of 161 giant tortoises, 74 Floreana Tortoises and 87 Espanola Tortoises, hatched in the Breeding Center of Santa Cruz</p> <p>Also, during this breeding season, a total of 185 giant tortoises hatched in the Breeding Center of Isabela</p> | IS | <p>The objective of this outcome is to increase the production of giant tortoises at the Giant Tortoise Breeding Centers on Santa Cruz and Isabela. Several site visits to the Giant Tortoise Breeding Centers on Santa Cruz and Isabela have been realized in order to define areas that need to be modified and identify new areas for expansion. A local engineer was contracted in order to draft the designs for the modifications and expansions. GC is currently preparing the procurement of the construction services required to renovate and expand the giant tortoise breeding centers.</p> <p>Closely related to the expansion of the Giant Tortoise Breeding Centers is the strengthening of the <i>Chelonoidis niger</i> breeding program in order to repopulate Floreana with giant tortoises after the removal of introduced rodents is accomplished. <i>Chelonoidis niger</i> is considered extinct but individuals with partial Floreana Tortoise ancestry were located on Wolf Volcano on Isabela Island and the Giant Tortoise Restoration Initiative intends to re breed this species.</p> <p>In order to increase the existing breeding stock at the Santa Cruz Giant Tortoise Breeding Center, a large field trip to Wolf Volcano in the northern part of Isabela was prepared with the intention to search for previously identified priority individuals with high ancestry of the Floreana Tortoise using genetic laboratory techniques.</p> <p>A field team of 45 Park rangers and scientists traversed approximately 77 square miles of tortoise habitat on Wolf Volcano during a 10-day expedition in February in order to locate and transfer hybrid giant tortoises. 29 tortoises with partial lineage to the extinct Floreana Giant Tortoise and one</p> |

| OUTCOMES TARGETS/INDICATORS | END OF PROJECT INDICATOR TARGET | END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS | PROGRESS RATING ⁷ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION |
|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| | from the populations of the Sierra Negra and Cerro Azul volcanoes | | | female with partial lineage to the extinct Pinta Giant Tortoise were transferred to the “Fausto Llerena” Breeding Center on Santa Cruz Island involving the DPNG ship Sierra Negra and the helicopter. After finishing the quarantine process, the Floreana hybrids will join the existing Floreana captive breeding program and will considerably boost its capacity. This outcome was not significantly affected by COVID 19 related restrictions so far |

| COMPONENT 3 IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING | JUSTIFICATION | RATING TREND |
|--|--|--------------|
| HS | A highly satisfactory rating has been given to Component 3. The project has made excellent progress in implementing both outcomes. The project is closely monitoring the translocated tortoises to achieve the expected targets. Also, the outcome was not significantly affected by COVID and this has made it possible to continue the planned work. | NA |

c. Overall Project Results Rating

OVERALL PROJECT RESULTS IMPLEMENTATION RATING

| OVERALL RATING | JUSTIFICATION | RATING TREND ⁸ |
|----------------|--|---------------------------|
| S | A satisfactory rating has been given to the overall project results. After a year and six months under implementation, the project has good progress in all three components. They have worked closely with the government counterpart to advance the enabling conditions needed for future eradication of invasive species in Floreana island. Also, work on restoration is advancing well, the translocation of turtles was completed, and the project is monitoring the seeds dispersing. | NA |

d. Recommendations

| CORRECTIVE ACTION(S) | RESPONSIBLE PARTY | DEADLINE |
|---|-------------------|---------------|
| Keep monitoring COVID 19 impacts on project and propose adaptive actions in case delays continue. | PMU | June 2021 |
| For outcome 1.1. project needs to suggest a way to better measure the impact of the project for this outcome. | PMU | December 2020 |

⁸ **Rating trend:** Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

SECTION III: PROJECT RISKS STATUS AND RATING

a. Progress towards Implementing the Project Risk Mitigation Plan

This section describes the activities implemented to manage and reduce high, substantial, modest, and low risks of the project. This section has three parts:

- a. Ratings for the progress towards implementing measures to mitigate project risks and a project risks annual reassessment

a. Progress towards Implementing the Project Risk Mitigation and Plan Project Risks Annual Reassessment

| PROJECT RISKS | PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE | MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION | PROGRESS RATING ⁹ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION | PRODOC RISK RATING | CURRENT FYXX RISK RATING | RISK RATING TREND ¹⁰ |
|---|---|---|------------------------------|---|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Risk 1: Inadequate consultation with, and engagement by, key stakeholders, including residents of Floreana Island | The project includes a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (see Appendix IX). Overall, the project has been designed to build on the GoE's, and its conservation partners', commitment to working together through inclusive, transparent, participatory processes. Further consultations are planned for the full project. These will include consultations regarding key activities, such as: sustainable | Intensive stakeholder engagement especially in Component 2, including residents of Floreana. In Component 1, all relevant stakeholders have been involved in the evaluation of the biosecurity system. DPNG is closely involved in activities of Component 3. | IS | <p>Significant progress has been made in implementing activities of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. As a result, there is a high level of mutual confidence between stakeholders, the project management team, and IC staff involved in Component 2, including residents of Floreana.</p> <p>Although the COVID epidemic and its related restrictions have put this process temporarily on hold we are confident that stakeholder engagement will be resumed to its previous level as soon as restrictions will be lifted. Nevertheless, we are aware that this will require a starting period that should be taken into account in project planning</p> | Low | Low | Unchanged |

⁹ **O**= Overdue; **D**= Delayed; **NS**= Not started on schedule; **IS**= Under implementation on schedule; and **CA**= Completed/Achieved

¹⁰ **Rating trend:** Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

| PROJECT RISKS | PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE | MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION | PROGRESS RATING ⁹ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION | PRODOC RISK RATING | CURRENT FYXX RISK RATING | RISK RATING TREND ¹⁰ |
|---|---|---|------------------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------------|---|
| | farming practices; a Floreana Parish Council (FPC) Declaration, and; an operational plan for eradication of invasive rodents and feral cats, and associated risk management plans. | | | | | | |
| Risk 2: Weak governmental coordination and management capacity | The project design incorporates the lessons learned from previous projects in ensuring that the GoE is prepared to dedicate the highly-qualified staff needed to ensure project success. Customized institutional arrangements will provide mechanisms for the government to effectively collaborate with other partners in project implementation. | Project is implemented in close cooperation with main project partners ABG and DPNG. In Component 1, the Biosecurity Specialist works part of his time directly with ABG's staff in ABG's offices through an institutional arrangement. In components 2 and 3, the fact that the project office is located within the DPNG administration building through an institutional arrangement allows a similar close cooperation. | IS | The fact that the project is located on an island with a relatively small population and short spatial distances allows very close and direct cooperation with the main project partners ABG and DPNG on a daily basis. These conditionals allowed activities to quickly resume after restrictions related to the COVID epidemic were partly lifted. | Medium | Medium | Unchanged with a trend towards decreasing |
| Risk 3: Government turnover | The project will be nearing completion before | As the risk is not activated, a mitigation action has not been applied | NS | | Medium | Medium | Unchanged |

| PROJECT RISKS | PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE | MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION | PROGRESS RATING ⁹ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION | PRODOC RISK RATING | CURRENT FYXX RISK RATING | RISK RATING TREND ¹⁰ |
|--|--|---|------------------------------|---|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| leading to changes in priority | the next elections when any new incoming government would take power (approximately May 2021), i.e. nearly all of the project will occur during a single presidential cycle. Finally, the project executing agency is well versed in executing projects in a less-stable environment | | | | | | |
| Risk 4: Various biological risks associated with tortoise translocation, including vectoring plant seeds among islands, disease risk, invasion risk, etc. | In light of the several risks associated with tortoise translocation, during the PPG, an Environmental Management Plan (EMP) was developed. Together, the elements of the EMP provide an effective set of risk mitigation measures for Component 3 activities | The EMP includes a detailed risk management for Component 3 and its activities. The Giant Tortoise Restoration Initiative follows strictly the suggested risk mitigation measures that were incorporated into the project design or that are managed through ongoing monitoring | IS | The Giant Tortoise Restoration Initiative is managed by professionals with decades of experience in Giant Tortoise Breeding and Restoration. The team is familiar with all the standards applied for the translocation of Giant Tortoises between islands. The tortoise monitoring protocols are part of the long term risk mitigation measures | Medium | Low | Decreasing |
| Risk 5: COVID 19 epidemic | | The Project Management Team in cooperation with | | The project team is strictly following government, IC, and CI GEF imposed | N/A | High | Unchanged with a |

| PROJECT RISKS | PRODOC RISK MITIGATION MEASURE | MITIGATION MEASURES IMPLEMENTATION | PROGRESS RATING ⁹ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION | PRODOC RISK RATING | CURRENT FYXX RISK RATING | RISK RATING TREND ¹⁰ |
|---------------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|---|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | <p>IC put a multitude of mitigation measures in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revision and adaptation of annual workplan and budget - Application of adaptive management measures - Preparing of procurement packages upfront where possible and appropriate during contagious phase - Procurement of goods and services from local suppliers where possible and appropriate - Update existent and prepare new management tools | | <p>COVID 19 guidelines. During the contagious phase of the pandemic, all members of the project team have been relocated to home offices. Continuous meetings of project team and IC were held remotely. Adapted project management and an updated procurement list was discussed and agreed with CI GEF. A summary of the meeting was sent to CI GEF by e-mail. In addition, the project contributed to CI GEF's assessment of the pandemic on projects. The pandemic will cause a delay in implementation of project activities in components 1 and 2; so far we do not expect significant impacts on component 3</p> | | | trend towards decreasing |

| OVERALL RATING OF PROJECT RISKS | JUSTIFICATION | RISK RATING TREND ¹¹ |
|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| M | A Medium rating has been given for the project risks section. Although the project is taking all the mitigation measures and no issues are foreseen, COVID 19 has impacted the project causing several delays. These impacts need to be monitored closely to ensure the project delivers as expected in FY21 and activities can be completed on time. | NA |

Recommendations

| MITIGATION AND CORRECTIVE ACTION(S) | RESPONSIBLE PARTY | DEADLINE |
|--|-------------------|-----------|
| Closely monitor COVID-19 measures and restrictions that affect project activities. | PMU | June 2021 |

¹¹ **Rating trend:** Increasing, Unchanged or Decreasing

SECTION IV: PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS IMPLEMENTATION STATUS AND RATING

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved Environmental and Social Safeguard plans, as well as recommendations to improve the implementation of the safeguard plans, when needed. This section is divided in three parts:

- a. Progress towards Complying with the CI-GEF Project Agency's Environmental & Social Safeguards
- b. Overall Project Safeguard Implementation Rating
- c. Recommendations

a. Progress towards Complying with the CI-GEF Project Agency's Environmental & Social Safeguards

| MINIMUM SAFEGUARD INDICATORS | PROJECT TARGET | END OF YEAR STATUS | PROGRESS RATING ¹² | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION |
|---|----------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| PROTECTION OF NATURAL HABITATS 1. Number of Hectares of natural and/or critical natural habitats loss or degraded | 0 | 0 | IS | <p>In total 155 juveniles and 31 sub-adult giant tortoises have been translocated to Santa Fe Island. In total there are currently 582 <i>Chelonoidis hoodensis</i> tortoises roaming on Santa Fe Island. All tortoises released on Santa Fe were equipped with microchips for long-term population monitoring.</p> <p>In addition, 46 fenced control areas and 182 sample points were established in order to monitor ecological changes associated with the tortoise translocation on Santa Fe. Since all giant tortoises released are either juveniles or sub-adults and the current overall population number is small, it is too early to expect any potential loss or degradation of critical natural habitats which is also confirmed by the comparison of</p> |

¹² O= Overdue; D= Delayed; NS= Not started on schedule; IS= Under implementation on schedule; and CA= Completed/Achieved

| | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|----|--|
| | | | | sample points in tortoise release areas and fenced control areas |
| ACCOUNTABILITY AND GRIEVANCE MECHANISM | | | | |
| 1. Number of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism | 0 | 0 | IS | Posters explaining the accountability and grievance mechanism were produced and placed at the Project office and the offices of local project partners: IC, ABG, DPNG, GC, and Floreana Community Council. In Floreana, we realized a meeting with local stakeholders and representatives of local institutions. So far we haven't received any complaints |
| 2. Percentage of conflict and complaint cases reported to the project's Accountability and Grievance Mechanism that have been resolved | 0 | 0 | | |
| GENDER MAINSTREAMING | | | | |
| 1. Number of men and women that participated in project activities (e.g. meetings, workshops, consultations) | Women account for at least 30% of persons participating in project meetings, workshops or consultations | Men 258 Women 144 (35%) | IS | Numbers don't include regular meetings with ABG and DPNG staff Numbers represent meetings with ABG staff at inspection points and stakeholders of biosecurity system, stakeholders, households and farmers on Floreana and Park Rangers and scientists involved in Component 3 |
| 2. Number of men and women that received benefits (e.g. employment, income generating activities, training, access to natural resources, land tenure or resource rights, equipment, leadership roles) from the project | Women account for at least 30% of persons trained and/or receiving other benefits | 3 families | IS | This category refers to the chicken coops that are currently being constructed on Floreana. Chicken coops will be handed over to farmer families |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|----|--|
| 3. Number of strategies, plans (e.g. management plans and land use plans), and policies derived from the project that include gender considerations (this indicator applies to relevant projects) | All strategies, plans and policies developed with the support of the project will include gender considerations | | IS | The operational plan and the risk management plans are including gender considerations |
| STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT | | | | |
| 1. Number of government agencies, civil society organizations, private sector, indigenous peoples, and other stakeholder groups that have been involved in the project implementation phase on an annual basis | At least 15 annually | 17 | IS | C1 ABG, DPNG, CGREG, PCL, TAGSA, Palismar, Storeocean C2 DPNG, ABG, CGREG, Municipio de San Cristóbal, Capitanía de Puerto, MSP, MdE, MAG Escuela Amazonas, |
| 2. Number persons (sex-disaggregated) that have been involved in project implementation phase (on an annual basis) | At least 100 men and 100 women annually | Men 192 Women 87 | IS | C3 DPNG, Scientists from different research institutes Park Rangers represent the highest number of persons involved in project implementation last year Since project start, |
| 3. Number of engagement (e.g. meeting, workshops, consultations) with stakeholders during the project implementation phase (on an annual basis) | At least 12 annually | 26 | IS | 26 engagements with stakeholders have taken place. The number does not include regular meetings with DPNG and ABG |
| 4. Percentage of stakeholders who rate as satisfactory the level at which their views and concerns are taken into account by the project (<i>responsible party for measuring this indicator is CI-GEF Agency and this will be undertaken by the consultant hired by the CI-GEF Agency to conduct the MTR and Terminal Evaluation</i>) | >95% | | IS | To be undertaken by the consultant hired by the CI-GEF Agency to conduct the MTR and Terminal Evaluation |

b. Information on Progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement

Significant progress on stakeholder engagement was made since project start, especially in Components 1 and 2. Component 3 is highly specific in its objective and deals mainly with the National Park. In Component 1, all potential stakeholders have been involved in the evaluation of the biosecurity inspection and control system and contributed with valuable information. In Component 2, all potential stakeholders were actively involved in all aspects of the component, especially in the review and discussion of the Risk Management Plans and sustainable farming practices. The stakeholder engagement process was significantly impacted by the COVID epidemic due to social distancing, interisland travel restrictions, etc. So far, we do not know, when exactly we can resume stakeholder engagement in Component 2. As soon as interisland travel restrictions are lifted, stakeholder engagement in Component 2 will resume. We are aware that this might take a restart phase to get back to the high level of engagement that existed before the epidemic.

c. Provide information on the progress towards achieving gender sensitive measures/targets

Overall women's participation (stakeholders, households, and farmers) was about 35%. Although the relatively high number of men's participation is largely due to the high number of Park Rangers who participated in training workshops and field trips of Component 3. If these 95 Park Rangers are not considered, women's participation goes up to 47%. This shows that a purely quantitative approach to measure the impact of the project's activities on gender mainstreaming is not necessarily appropriate. Stakeholders in Components 1 and 2 are represented by women in key positions who have a high influence on project implementation. It is therefore recommended to complete the numerical indicators with qualitative information.

The Project Management Team has 2 male staff and 2 female staff, the Project Management Committee has 2 female members and 3 male members, the Project Steering Committee in its last meeting was represented by 3 female members and 2 male members.

d. Overall Project Safeguard Implementation Rating

SUMMARY: PROJECT SAFEGUARD IMPLEMENTATION RATING BY TYPE OF PLAN

| SAFEGUARDSTRIGGERED BY THE PROJECT (delete those not applicable) | CURRENT FY20 IMPLEMENTATION RATING | RATING TREND |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Accountability and Grievance Mechanisms | HS | NA |
| Gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP) | HS | NA |
| Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) | HS | NA |
| Protection of Natural Habitats | HS | NA |

OVERALL PROJECT SAFEGUARD IMPLEMENTATION RATING

| RATING | JUSTIFICATION | RATING TREND |
|--------|---|--------------|
| HS | The project has taken steps to widely disseminate the grievance mechanism. Women's participation is above the target set by the project. The number of stakeholders and engagements are also above the target set by the project. | NA |

e. Recommendations

| CORRECTIVE ACTION(S) | RESPONSIBLE PARTY | DEADLINE |
|--|-------------------|---------------|
| The project is encouraged to provide qualitative information on gender mainstreaming or develop qualitative gender indicators to complement the quantitative data. | PMU | June 30, 2021 |

SECTION V: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION EXPERIENCES, KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND LESSONS LEARNED

Required topics

1. Knowledge activities/products (when applicable), as outlined in the knowledge management plan approved at CEO endorsement/approval

Lessons learned:

The project did not plan specific knowledge management activities or products. Only component 3 includes the development and testing of a field monitoring protocol to evaluate the development of relocated giant tortoises on Santa Fe Island and the publication of technical and scientific results and lessons learned regarding tortoise relocation and habitat restoration during the second half of the project.

Nevertheless, several peer-reviewed pieces and general publications were produced that are related to Floreana, often not project-specific but referencing or using it as an example:

<https://www.islandconservation.org/island-journey-dive-restoration-floreana-island-galapagos/>

<https://www.islandconservation.org/search-galapagos-short-eared-owls-floreana-island/>

<https://www.islandconservation.org/new-research-eight-priority-islands-restoration/>

<https://www.islandconservation.org/preventing-80-extinctions-2020-restore-islands/>

<https://www.islandconservation.org/bbc-newsroom-restore-169-islands-curb-extinction-crisis/>

<https://www.islandconservation.org/169-islands-offer-hope-stemming-extinction-crisis/>

Castaño PA, Brown S, Fisher P, Holmes ND, Araujo A, Moreno F, Gaona C, Hanson C. 2020. Planning eradication of invasive rodents from Floreana Island: assessment of toxic bait efficacy in wild-caught black rats (*Rattus rattus*) and house mice (*Mus musculus*). Currently being reviewed

Torres-Carvajal O, Castaño PA, Moreno F. 2020. Comparative phylogeography of Floreana's lizards supports Galápagos Pleistocene paleogeographical model and informs conservation management decisions. Currently being reviewed

We learned, that the project would definitely benefit from a knowledge and communication component considering the unique combination of removing alien invasive species from Floreana Island, upgrade the biosecurity system and repopulate islands with giant tortoises. Nevertheless, the implementation of a knowledge and communication component would require additional funding.

Additional topics (please choose two)

2. Scientific and technological issues

Several scientific studies related to the population dynamics of endemic and native species on Floreana have been accomplished with the aim to add to an ecological baseline of Floreana. These studies add to the viability of the set of operational and risk management plans of component 2 and will be part of the ESIA.

As yet, a broad set of scientific information related to the removal of rodents and the application of new technological equipment was produced within the Floreana project. Nevertheless, considering the fact that Floreana is so far the biggest island with a permanent population where a rodent eradication program is in the making, a sound scientific study about the dynamics and influencing social interactions involved, would reveal invaluable information for future similar programs on other populated islands. Floreana's small population size would allow a complete survey of the entire population and stakeholders involved. It would be relatively easy to investigate the key social factors and dynamics for successful program implementation, e.g. correlations between demographic qualities and degree of support for the project, etc. Sound scientific investigation previous to the realization of the rodent removal is crucial considering the unique setting and scale of the project.

Component 3 adds completely new and innovative scientific aspects. It is the first time that an island restoration initiative is undertaken by relocating giant tortoises from an ecological similar island to an island that was once populated with its own endemic species that became extinct for reasons not identified so far. The relocation of giant tortoises as ecosystem engineers or keystone specie was initiated after the removal of goats, an invasive alien species once introduced by sailors. Outcome 2 contributes to another unique scientific challenge. The Giant Tortoise Breeding Program is successfully rebreeding the Floreana Giant Tortoise, a species that once became extinct due to human activity and invasive alien species. The expedition to Wolf Volcano located, identified, and translocated hybrids with a high percentage of the Floreana lineage in their genome to the Santa Cruz Breeding Facility that will boost the Floreana Tortoise rebreeding program.

3. Project institutional arrangements, including project governance

Project governance worked smoothly during the first year. The strategic location of the project office within the installations of the National Park administration is key for efficient project governance. The fact that almost all of the main project partners (DPNG, ABG, GC, and IC) and their main offices are located within walking distance on the same island allows close coordination with project partners and institutions and is crucial for efficient and smooth cooperation. Short spatial distances are encouraging the preference of having in-person meetings over virtual meetings and communication is mostly direct and face to face; something that we feel contributes significantly to smooth project governance and the achievement of written agreements.

The close distances and personal coordination that worked very well during the project's implementation resulted to be a challenge during the contagious phase of the pandemic with strict social distancing and remote working in place because the pace of decision-making was significantly slowed down as well as the achievement of agreements. Even more during the current epidemic, the capacity and coverage of cellphone and internet services were limited, and remote communication was challenging.

APPENDIX I: PROJECT ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING

| Rating | | Overdue (O) | Delayed (D) | Not started on schedule (NS) | Under implementation on schedule (IS) | Completed/Achieved (CA) |
|--------------------------------|----|-------------|-------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | HS | 0% | | 100% | | |
| Satisfactory (S) | S | 20% | | 80% | | |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | MS | 40% | | 60% | | |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | MU | 60% | | 40% | | |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | U | 80% | | 20% | | |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | HU | 100% | | 0% | | |

- **Highly Satisfactory:** 100% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project. The project can be presented as an example of “good practice” project,
- **Satisfactory:** 80% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; except for only 20% that are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action,
- **Moderately Satisfactory:** 60% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; while 40% are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action,
- **Moderately Unsatisfactory:** 40% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; while 60% are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action,
- **Unsatisfactory:** only 20% of the indicators: a) have been completed/achieved, b) are under implementation on schedule, and/or c) have not started but are on schedule, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project; while 80% are delayed and/or overdue and need remedial action, and
- **Highly Unsatisfactory:** 100% of the indicators: a) are overdue, and/or b) delayed in their implementation, according to the original/formally revised Project Annual Workplan for the project.

APPENDIX II: RISK RATINGS

| Rating | |
|-----------------|---|
| Low (L) | L |
| Moderate (M) | M |
| Substantial (S) | S |
| High (H) | H |

- **Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.
- **Moderate Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.
- **Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
- **High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.

APPENDIX III: PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT EXPECTED OUTPUTS

| INDICATORS | PROJECT TARGET | END OF YEAR INDICATOR STATUS | PROGRESS RATING ¹³ | COMMENTS/JUSTIFICATION |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| Outcome 1.1 The number of invasive alien species entering the Galapagos archipelago is substantially reduced | | | | |
| Output Indicator 1.1.1: Action Plan accepted by the Project Steering Committee (PSC) | One document approved by the Project Steering Committee (PSC) | Assessment of the biosecurity system at control points is completed The procurement for the professional services to prepare the Action Plan is almost finished | IS D | The procurement process for the professional services to prepare the Action Plan was significantly protracted due to the COVID 19 epidemic |
| Output Indicator 1.1.2: % of detection equipment identified in the Action Plan purchased and installed inadequate infrastructure | 10% of equipment identified in the Action Plan purchased and installed | Procurement of some consumables and small detection equipment completed Procurement of 2 vehicles completed Procurement process for incinerator is almost completed Walk-in freezers are in reconditioning Develop software to automate the inspection system is overdue Purchase automation equipment is overdue | IS CA IS D O O | Some procurements could be realized during COVID 19 lockdown This procurement process was brought forward during the COVID 19 lockdown This procurement was put on hold due to the COVID 19 lockdown This activity depends on results from the Action Plan This activity depends on results from the Action Plan |

¹³ O= Overdue; D= Delayed; NS= Not started on schedule; IS= Under implementation on schedule; and CA= Completed/Achieved

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|----|---|
| Output Indicator 1.1.3: % of Action Plan recommendations regarding Protocols and capacity building targets implemented | 20% of the recommendations implemented | Update Protocols to establish steps, guidelines, responsibilities, and functions | O | This activity is part of the Action Plan |
| | | Develop work flow charts and other materials to help implement the protocols | NS | This activity is part of the Action Plan |
| | | Realize training workshops to gain understanding of updated protocols | NS | This activity depends on the previous activities |
| Outcome 2.1 The social license is established for the protection and recovery of Floreana Island ecosystems | | | | |
| Output Indicator 2.1.1: The % of male and female of farmers that implement ecologically sustainable farming practices | 100 % of farmers implement ecologically sustainable farming practices | Construction of 3 chicken coops completed About 40% of farmers are taking new or improved ecologically sustainable action related to sustainable chicken, pig, and cattle farming | D | 3 of 8 chicken coops are constructed; construction was put on hold due to COVID 19 lockdown. When 8 chicken coops are constructed, 15 out of 17 farmers on Floreana will apply sustainable chicken farming. In addition, all cattle and pig farmers are applying similar approaches |
| Output Indicator 2.1.2: Declaration approved by the Floreana Parish Council | One declaration developed and adopted by the Floreana Parish Council | N/A | NS | |
| Output Indicator 2.1.3: Approved Operational Plan | One operational plan approved by PSC | Operational plan package is currently being reviewed by DPNG and ABG | D | ABG and DPNG already communicated that the revision is currently put on hold because both institutions are heavily involved in quarantine measures |
| Output Indicator 2.1.4.a: Approved risk management plans | 6 risk management plans approved by PSC | The set of risk management plans for pets, freshwater, children, agriculture, livestock, nearshore fisheries, rodents, and visitors was sent to partner institutions for final review and feedback | D | All review efforts, discussions, and meetings are put on hold at the moment due to the COVID 19 situation |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|----|--|
| Output Indicator 2.1.4.b: Percentage of the Floreana island male and female residents who participate in the consultations regarding the risk management plans developed for the Project | 100% of the male and female residents participate in the consultations | 112% of all households have been visited at least one time (some twice) by IC staff in order to present and discuss risk management plans | D | All review efforts, discussions and meetings are put on hold at the moment due to the COVID 19 situation |
| Output Indicator 2.1.5: Environmental and Social Impact Assessment completed and approved | One ESIA completed and approved by PSC | Terms of reference are being reviewed by IC and DPNG and will be sent to CI GEF for approval | D | Review process was significantly protracted due to COVID 19 |
| Outcome 3.1: Ecosystem processes, particularly seed dispersal, re-initiated across Santa Fe island (2,413 ha) as the result of the translocation of giant tortoises | | | | |
| Output Indicator 3.1.1: # of giant tortoises (<i>Chelonoidis hoodensis</i>) translocated to Santa Fe Island | On average, at least 40 juvenile giant tortoises (<i>Chelonoidis hoodensis</i>) are translocated annually | 155 juvenile giant tortoises (<i>Chelonoidis hoodensis</i>) have been translocated | CA | |
| | At least 30 sub-adult giant tortoises (<i>Chelonoidis hoodensis</i>) are translocated | 31 sub-adult giant tortoises (<i>Chelonoidis hoodensis</i>) have been translocated | CA | |
| Output Indicator 3.1.2: Tested and optimized monitoring and evaluation protocols accepted by the Project Steering Committee | One monitoring and evaluation protocol | Monitoring and evaluation is currently being realized | IS | The last field trip to Santa Fe in order to follow up with the testing of monitoring variables in the field was accomplished on March 15 |
| Outcome 3.2: Production in captivity of giant tortoises for future reintroductions throughout the archipelago is significantly increased | | | | |
| Output Indicator 3.2.1: Number of centers modernized and expanded | Two centers modernized | Terms of reference are being reviewed by GC and DPNG and will be sent to CI GEF for approval | D | Review process was significantly protracted due to COVID 19 |
| Output Indicator 3.2.2: # of breeders selected, located, and transferred to breeding center | At least five giant tortoises located and transferred (20% increase in captive population of Floreana breeders) | 29 giant tortoises were located and transferred to the Giant Tortoise Breeding Center on Santa Cruz | CA | |
| Output Indicator 3.2.3: # of scientific, technical and popular articles and reports | 1 peer-reviewed article and 2 popular articles produced | N/A | NS | |