P?ramos for Life

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10361
Countries

Colombia
Project Name

P?ramos for Life
Agencies

UNDP
Date received by PM

8/27/2021
Review completed by PM

10/28/2021
Program Manager

Mark Zimsky
Focal Area

Biodiversity
Project Type

FSP

PIF □
CEO Endorsement □

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes, only the scale has increased. Cleared.

Agency Response
Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

NA.

Agency Response
Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/13/2021

Yes and these are consistent with the increased funding and ambition of the project. Cleared.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project?s expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/13/2021

Yes, and the table presented clearly articulates this. Cleared.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

NA.

Agency Response
Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes, cleared. A summary provided in portal with full elaboration in Annex 9 of the prodoc.

Agency Response
Gender Equality and Women?s Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

The budgeted M&E plan in section 9 of the Portal entry shows a total M&E budget of $271,870, while the budget table under Annex E shows a total M&E budget of $669,800 .

Please revise or clarify the discrepancy.

10/28/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response
The total M&E budget of $271,870 is correct; this was revised in Annex E and in the UNDP-GEF Project Document, Annex 1. The amount of $669,800 corresponds to the budget for Component 4 (Outputs 4.1.1 and 4.1.2).

Reference in CEO Endorsement Document:
Portal: M&E budget and Annex E
UNDP- GEF Project Document, Annex 1

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Budget table:
- UNDP should be listed as responsible entity for the low value grants in the budget table:
- The following two items seems to be charged to the wrong component: the pilot information exchange network and community communication program should be charged to component 4 but not M&E, while international consultants for MTR and TE should be charged to M&E instead of component 4.

Please revise accordingly.

10/28/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response
As suggested, UNDP has been listed as the responsible entity for the low-value grants (Components 1, 2, and 3) in the budget table.

The issue regarding items charged to the wrong components was corrected after revising the M&E budget and the budget for Component 4; the main issue had to do with the fact that the budget to M&E was wrongly assigned to Component 4 and vice versa.

Reference in CEO Endorsement Document:
Portal: M&E budget and Annex E
UNDP- GEF Project Document, Annex 1

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

All previous comments have been addressed.

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Response to comments from Germany are adequate. Cleared.

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

NA

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

NA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

NA

Agency Response
Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/13/2021

No.

The requested funding at CEO endorsement stage ($13,611,468) increased by 287% from PIF stage ($3,502,968). This must be processed as a major amendment with all the required steps including the new Letter of Endorsement. The GEF Agency also needs to fill out the Notification for Major amendment. Only when the above steps are completed and processed, the project can be resubmitted with all the other revisions included as identified in the review sheet above.

10/28/2021

A notification of major amendment is uploaded in the portal, a new LOE is uploaded in the portal. All revisions requested have been adequately addressed.

CEO endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	**10/28/2021**	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The Project objective is to conserve p?ramo ecosystems through the promotion of sustainable systems for biodiversity conservation, ecosystem and agro-biodiversity services, and socio-environmental conflict management within p?ramo complexes. This will be achieved through four interrelated components that will allow strengthening the governance framework for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in sixteen paramos landscapes, biodiversity conservation and improved connectivity and ecosystem services, and transitioning to activities that are compatible with the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in prioritized p?ramo landscapes. This strategy will reduce threats to biodiversity delivering global environmental benefits including 1,091,398 hectares (ha) of nine terrestrial PAs under improved management for conservation and sustainable use; 4,389 ha of vulnerable ecosystems and lands restored; 1,051,306 ha of p?ramo landscapes under improved practices; and improved

conservation of species of global importance such as the Andean Condor (*Vultur gryphus*), migratory and endemic birds (e.g., *Oxypogon guereinii, Anas discors, and Pandion haliaethus*), the spectacled bear (*Tremarctos ornatus*), and the mountain tapir (*Tapirus pinchaque*) among other species of plants and animals. In addition, it will directly benefit 5,816 people (50% women; 50% men). The project will have a duration of 5 years with a total investment of USD 87,628,681, USD 13,611,468 of which will be provided by the GEF.