

Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the tourism sector of the protected areas and strategic ecosystems of San Andres, Old Providence and Santa Catalina islands

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10578

Countries

Colombia

Project Name

Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the tourism sector of the protected areas and strategic ecosystems of San Andres, Old Providence and Santa Catalina islands

Agencies

WWF-US

Date received by PM

12/3/2021

Review completed by PM

5/12/2022

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

12/7/2021

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

12/7/2021

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

12/7/2021

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

12/7/2021

All required cofinancing letters are presented.

In terms of entry into the portal, please enter as a separate line item, each contribution from the different secretariats of the San Andreas Municipality: Tourism, Public services, and agriculture and fisheries. For each of these contributions, please explain how you arrived at a total of multiple millions of dollars of in-kind contributions which would indicate very high staff costs to reach a total of \$18 million. Please evaluate whether parts of this cofinance could be identified as investment mobilized. It is unusual to see such a high level of in-kind contributions in terms of their overall dollar value.

4/13/2022

Please include ?Colombia? after Conservation International so there are no confusion with CI (GEF Agency)

5/12/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

05/10/2022

Colombia was added to the Conservation International entry in table C.

4/6/21

The co-finance letter for Gobernacion was revised to indicate \$7,246,377 of investment mobilized. The co-finance table in the CEO Endorsement Request has been updated to show the contribution from the different secretariats of the San Andres Municipality, and the investment mobilized description was included.

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

12/7/2021

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

12/7/2021

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
4/13/2022

1. Six protected area WDPAs are missing under Core Indicators 1.2 and 2.1. Please add those, as these are mandatory at CEO Endorsement stage. What you have entered is the IUCN category not their WDPA ID.

2. Please deselect the Core Indicator 5 as no value is provided under this Core Indicator. If you can not do it, we can assist from the back end.

5/12/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
05/10/22

1. Core Indicators have been added in the portal: The Peak WDPA ID 555555773; Seaflower DMI 555636411; and Jhonny Cay Regional Park 555555779. Old Point Regional Mangrove Park is not listed on the WDPA. The necessary measures are being taken by the government authorities for the corrective action.

2.

Appreciate your help from the backend to deselect Core Indicator 5.

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
12/7/2021

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

12/7/2021

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

12/7/2021

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

12/7/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/7/2021

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

12/7/2021

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

12/7/2021

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

12/7/2021

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

12/7/2021

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
12/7/2021

Cleared.

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
12/7/2021

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
12/7/2021

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

12/7/2021

Cleared. Includes risk mitigation for COVID-19 impacts as well.

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

12/7/2021

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

12/7/2021

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
12/7/2021

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
4/13/2022

The Environmental and Social Safeguards Screening Tool and Environmental and Social Safeguards Risk Categorization Memorandum, and the project overall ESS risk is classified as low. The Part IV: Cross Cutting Principles (page 24-) and Part V Risks related to WWF Substantive Environmental and Social Standards (page 32-) in the Environmental and Social Safeguards Screening form identified many risks related to Human Rights, Gender Equality and Women's Rights, Children's rights, Conflict Sensitivity, Climate change, and standard on Indigenous Peoples. Part VI Conclusion of the project screening (page 38), however, does not mention any of these risks in the summary table and concluded as low risk project. Please clarify why all these risks identified in the above sections are not summarized in the conclusion table and why the project's overall risk is classified as low risk.

5/12/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
05/10/2022

All WWF projects are screened for existing landscape-level risks, which are often present in the countries where projects take place. This helps to determine if those risks

are likely to impact the project, or if the project has the potential to exacerbate those risks- identifying in those cases mitigation measures that should be taken. In this case, landscape level risks were identified in the screening, but are not specific to the project and are not anticipated to either impact the project or be exacerbated by the project. Clarification on this has been added to the updated Categorization Memo.

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

4/13/2022

The M&E Plan should describe the funds for each M&E activities under the M&E plan section. The means of verification, sources, frequency of updates and methodology including schedule and responsibilities for data collection should be explained.

On M&E and In section 9, please include the amounts of GEF resources to be use for M&E in the M&E budget table.

5/12/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

5/10/22

The means of verification (method), sources, frequency of updates (yearly targets) and methodology are included in the Results Framework in Annex A2. Section 9 has been updated and now also includes a table detailing M&E costs.

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

12/7/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/13/2022

There seems to be a mismatch between the total amounts provided in the project budget table (annex E) and those in table F. Please review and verify and ensure that all numbers match.

Regarding the budget:

1. Monitoring visits should be charged to the M&E and not across components.
2. Technical Coordinator and Management Director have been charged across the components and the PMC.
3. Rent and Operations Costs should be charged to the PMC portion of the budget.

5/12/2022

The budget table under Annex E and the table B now show differences. Please revise.

5/18/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

5/17/2022

Thank you. Figures have been updated in table B as well as alternative scenario and now match Annex E.

05/09/2022

The total amount was reviewed, and now the project budget (Annex E) and table F match.

1. Indeed, there was a misdescription in line 84 since these visits are not for monitoring purposes but for the technical experts of the PMU to be able to execute project activities including the execution of the stakeholder engagement plan and the gender action plan, visit local and institutional actors and to provide technical advice on technical activities developed by project partners.

2. GEF Technical Advisor and Coordinator: We have adjusted the name of this position to better reflect its role and responsibilities in the PMU. 10% of this position's time will be used for overall project management purposes. The other 90% will be dedicated to providing technical advice to project partners and direct execution of project activities under project components. Accordingly, 10% of this position's time has been allocated to PMC, while 90% is assigned to the technical project components budget.

The Management and Operations Director's costs have been fully allocated to the PMC.

3. Noted. The rent and operations cost have been removed from the Technical Component Budget.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/7/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/7/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/7/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/7/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/7/2021

NA.

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/7/2021

NA.

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/7/2021

NA.

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/7/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/7/2021

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

12/7/2021

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

12/7/2021

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
12/7/2021

NA.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/7/2021

Please address the issues identified above and resubmit.

4/13/2022

Many issues remain to be resolved. Please revise and resubmit.

On project information, per our calculation, the duration is 43 months if to meet the expected implementation start/completion date. Please verify and correct where necessary. Given the 4 week circulation period for this project you may want to push the expected implementation start to 7/1/2022.

5/16/2022

No.

The budget table under Annex E and the table B now show differences. Please revise and resubmit.

5/18/2022

Yes, CEO endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement****Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	12/7/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/13/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/16/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/16/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/18/2022

CEO Recommendation**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The project seeks to mainstream biodiversity conservation and green recovery in the tourism sector to maintain ecosystem health and the environmental goods and services provided by the Seaflower MPA. The project will be implemented in the Seaflower Marine Protected Area associated with the islands of San Andr s, Old Providence, and Santa Catalina (11,623 ha including key coral reef and seagrass ecosystems of the total 6,501,700 ha of the Seaflower MPA) and in the three regional protected areas of Jhonny Cay (44.2 ha), Old Point (247.56 ha) and The Peak (10.52 ha). Interventions will also focus on the non-protected but key terrestrial ecosystems of the islands of San Andr s, Old Providence, and Santa Catalina, especially in the mangroves (133.93 ha) and sandy beaches.

The project will be implemented through four Components:

Component 1: Planning and institutional framework for a biodiversity and green recovery focused tourism sector in the MPA, PAs and the three islands of the Archipelago.

Component 2: Management of tourism impacts on key biodiversity of the MPA, PAs and the three islands.

Component 3: Biodiversity mainstreaming in innovative coastal and marine local tourism development in the MPA, PAs and three islands.

Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation, awareness raising and knowledge management.

The proposed project will improve management of approximately 11,925 hectares of protected areas, including both terrestrial areas of the regional Protected Areas of Jhonny Cay, Old Point and The Peak, and marine protected areas including the Seaflower MPA and the marine areas of Jhonny Cay and Old Point. In addition, 4,363 hectares of landscapes will be under improved management practices to benefit biodiversity.

Adequate COVID 19 mitigation plans are proposed to support safe and responsible project implementation.