

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

Review PIF 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

3/24/2020

Review completed by PM

4/15/2020

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Please clarify why the budget per GEF-7 BD focal area strategy objective is identical when the focus of the components on a budgetary allocation basis is not identical when mapped back to the strategy objectives.

The threat analysis lists many threats that the project design and the Table B components do not address. These threats are also not addressed in the theory of change and the project design. Please clarify and revise the design and the theory of change to demonstrate how these other threats will be addressed.

Output 1.1.3 – Plan should be developed AND implemented.

Based on the content of component 2, one of the outcomes should be improved management effectiveness of the MPA and the terrestrial PAs. Please include the baseline score and the expected increases in each due to the project investment.

Component three: in the component and the text it is not clear why 5 tourism initiatives are selected as opposed to 2 or 15. In addition, the project design provides no real analysis of the tourism industry itself: number of operators, their size, distribution of small, medium and large enterprises, what sector of the tourism industry is exerting the most pressure, whether the strategy is targeting the most damaging part of the tourism sector and where the biodiversity return on investment will be highest with the small GEF investment etc. All of this must be clarified in the text, in the revised theory of change, and eventually in Table B.

Please provide a rationale for creating a financial mechanism (output 3.1.4) for restoration as this does not follow the current theory of change nor does it logically link to the tourism threat analysis.

4/13/2020

Thank you for the clarifications.

Please note that in Table B (please also see section on global environmental benefits) that none of the outcomes are actually measuring the condition of biodiversity that will benefit from the project investments, including the METT scores as noted in the first review, the condition of strategic ecosystems of the archipelago, including coral reefs, seagrass, mangroves. Please revise.

4/14/2020

Adequate clarifications provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

4/10/2020

Noted. The budget per GEF-7 BD focal area strategy was revised to align to table B outputs, and has been adjusted in the PIF Table A, accordingly.

Noted. A threat analysis has been carried out, based on literature review, results of stakeholder consultations and expert advice, and with the participation of CORALINA, Ministry of Environment, CI and WWF Colombia project focal points. The analysis identifies the main threats affecting the priority ecosystems of the Archipelago and identifies those that are likely to have the greatest impact on the priority ecosystems. The prioritized threats, which the project will seek to address, are summarized and described in the PIF page 20. Based on this threat analysis and prioritization, a conceptual model and a project theory of change exercise has been conducted, and the results are presented in the PIF, showing how the priority threats, and the associated barriers, will be addressed by the project.

Agreed. Output 1.1.3 language changed to show plan will be developed and under early stages of implementation through activities in Component 2 and 3. Plan will be implemented by responsible authorities but the timeframe of the plan exceeds the timeframe of the project.

Outcome 2.2 language has been changed to include improved management effectiveness of the MPA and terrestrial PAs. Regarding the baseline score of the PAs included in the project, only the Seaflower MPA has had METT evaluations in the past and this hasn't been updated recently. The data of the two past evaluations is included in the PIF. During PPG, METT baseline scores for the project MPA and PAs will be calculated.

Noted. Outcome 3.1 and Output 3.1.1 language adjusted to reflect the project will work with at least 5 existing local initiatives to mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable finance aspects. This has also been reflected and explained in the baseline and strategy sections in the PIF. The number of initiatives has been estimated based on available budget and on a list of local tourism initiatives pre identified by the government (as explained in the baseline section) with potential to become biodiversity friendly tourism businesses.

Noted. Output 3.1.4 has been modified. No financial mechanism will be created under this project. The work under component 3 will be focused on creating capacities for the sustainable finance of the biodiversity friendly local tourism initiatives supported by the project.

4/14/2020

Noted. As mentioned in previous response, only Seaflower MPA has had a METT evaluation but this has not been updated recently. Table 1 in the PIF lists PAs and METT scores (where available). METT baseline scores for the project MPA and PAs will be calculated during PPG.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Please clarify why no investment has been mobilized or cash resources given the fact that the project is focused on the private sector.

Please also clarify why the private sector, which is a key stakeholder, has not come forward with any cofinancing, cash or in-kind.

4/13/2020

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

4/10/2020

The private sector representing the mass “sun and beach” tourism will be engaged in component 1, in the design of the tourism plan. However, this doesn’t necessarily imply co financing from this private sector. However, during PPG, this option will be further explored.

Private sector co financing will come from the local initiatives the project wants to strengthen under Component 3. This co financing will be calculated during PPG, once the final list of initiatives is defined and a more detailed finance analysis is done.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

NA.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

NA.

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

NA.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

NA.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

First, project aims to restore ecosystems, but no restoration area number is included. Please include and clarify.

Second, METT baseline scores and names of the MPA and the terrestrial PAs should be included for indicator one and indicator two.

Third, indicator 5 is highlighted in the portal, but no figures are entered. Please clarify.

4/13/2020

Thank you for the clarifications. As noted above under Table B, the names of the PAs and the proposed improvement in METT scores should be included as an outcome in Table B.

4/14/2020

Adequate clarifications provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

4/10/2020

Corrected. The project will not do restoration but improve management effectiveness. This has been modified throughout the PIF.

Noted. These have been added to the core indicator worksheet and added and explained in the PIF.

This was a mistake and has been corrected. The project won't be reporting on the Core Indicator 5.

4/14/2020

Agreed. This issue will be addressed during PPG phase. The baseline assessment will provide information on the conservation status of the key ecosystems and based on that, clear indicators measuring biodiversity conditions and targets will be defined.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Many threats listed in the table on tourism and threats to biodiversity are not addressed by this project and the key stakeholders responsible for these threats do not appear to be engaged in the project design and it is not clear why: 1) infrastructure in coastal zone; 2) road development; 3) sewage management; 4) solid waste management; 5) freshwater consumption; 6) unsustainable fisheries; 7) demand for building materials. The narrow focus on tourism only could result in a GEF investment that is successful addressing one threat, while others continue unabated undermining any progress this small investment by GEF could achieve. Please clarify the logic and rationale of the project design and consider expanding the project to encompass a more robust biodiversity mainstreaming strategy for the islands that goes beyond just a small segment of the tourism industry.

One barrier identified within the strict threat from tourism is the lack of equipment including a vessel. What is the strategy of the project for purchasing and maintaining a vessel? What cofinancer will support this purchase?

With regards to the barrier on lack of tourism alternatives, there appears to be a fundamental flaw in reasoning. First, it is not clear from the problem statement how the tourism sector is stratified (number of operators, size of operators, revenue flow of operators, relative impact on biodiversity of operators related to size of operation, etc); hence we do not know if the focus on providing alternatives makes the most sense. We would want to support the transformation of the segment of the tourism industry that is having the most impact and it is not clear whether the project designers have undertaken such an analysis. Hence the project might successfully provide alternatives to “sun and beach” tourism, but only add to the pressures by proving more tourism options in addition to “sun and beach” as opposed to a more sustainable approach that transforms that segment of the tourism sector exerting the most impact on biodiversity. Please clarify this point in particular and include it when revising the project design to respond to the review. The PIF requires a presentation and analysis of the tourism sector in the islands as an input to the development of a theory of change that informs a comprehensive project design that will be sustainable in the long-term. The current design is very solution driven (ecotourism as solution) which is not supported by any evidence in the literature of similar kinds of approaches. Perhaps, the SGP can provide the kind of support to

community tourism initiatives the project is proposing, while a re-designed PIF looks at a more comprehensive biodiversity mainstreaming solution for the island complex that is the focus of the project.

4/13/2020

Thank you for the revisions, clarifications, and additions. Cleared.

Agency Response

4/10/2020

Noted. A threat analysis was carried out with the project proponents and has been added to the PIF (pg. 20).

As explained above, the threat analysis has been improved in the PIF. A threat analysis has been carried out, with participation of main project stakeholders. The analysis identifies the main threats affecting the priority ecosystems of the Archipelago and identifies those that are likely to have the greatest impact on the priority ecosystems. The prioritized threats, which the project will seek to address, are summarized and described in the PIF. Based on this threat analysis and prioritization, a conceptual model and a project theory of change exercise has been conducted, and the results are presented in the PIF, showing how the priority threats, and the associated barriers, will be addressed by the project.

The reference to a vessel was an example that has been removed from the text. The project doesn't aim to purchase or maintain a vessel.

The revised PIF includes more information on the tourism sector, which is mainly divided into two segments, mass "sun and beach tourism" and "small scale local tourism initiatives", some of them led by local Raizal communities. During the PPG phase we will be able to provide a more thorough analysis of the tourism sector in the Archipelago. The project will address the most important threats that both segments of the tourism sector pose to biodiversity in the Archipelago, as identified in the threat analysis. The threat posed by the unplanned mass tourism infrastructure and the excessive physical presence of tourists will be tackled with a new tourism plan, more capacities for spatial planning and for better environmental management, and for more control and surveillance, including carrying capacity criteria, based on improved information of the impacts of tourism sector on biodiversity (currently non existent). The tourism plan will also provide regulation to the local tourism lodging, an emerging sector with negative environmental impact potential. The project will provide capacities and support to local initiatives to transform existing local initiatives into more biodiversity friendly businesses that can be financially sustainable.

Agreed with the comment on the risk of providing alternatives to the sun and beach model. The project won't provide alternatives, but will work with an existing emerging sector segment, the local tourism, that is also considered as an important threat to the biodiversity in the islands. The project will support mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into existing local tourism businesses.

The suggestion of looking at the SGP for supporting community tourism activities has been explored. Unfortunately, the SGP in Colombia has prioritized the Pacific, Andean and Amazon regions and has not considered the Caribbean region in any of the planned GEF 7 call of proposals.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Please present the synthesized results and evaluation findings of the GEF financed project , ID 3532, Protecting Biodiversity in the Southwestern Caribbean Sea and describe how the current investment complements and is applying the lessons learned from this previous GEF project.

4/13/2020

Thank you for the revisions, clarifications, and additions. Cleared.

Agency Response

4/10/2020

Noted. Lessons learned from the previous GEF projects have been analyzed, and information on how this project will apply them has been added in Section 6 on Coordination.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Please see comments above on the project design in question one.

The alternative is very narrowly defined to one small part of the solution, based on the threat analysis undertaken. The PIF provides no information on what will happen to the “sun and beach” segment of the tourism market which the PIF implies is responsible for most of the damage to biodiversity. Nor does the alternative scenario discuss how “biodiversity-friendly” tourism activities will not simply be an additional tourism offer, hence putting additional pressures on already stressed resource. No evidence in the literature suggests that ecotourism can replace the mass tourism which is the driver of biodiversity loss in many tourism destinations, including the Seaflower MPA.

Thus, we believe the theory of change is fundamentally flawed and does not reflect the actual problem analysis that has been presented. Hence, we suggest that this be reframed to design a more comprehensive solution that goes beyond the development of a plan and provides a long-term path towards sustainable tourism in the islands. This would necessitate more evidence of involvement of the private sector in the formulation of the project design and the proposed solutions.

4/13/2020

Thank you for the revisions, clarifications, and additions. As noted throughout this second review, please include the actual biodiversity outcomes that the project will produce and that will be measured as indicative of successful mainstreaming of biodiversity and production of global benefits.

4/14/2020

Adequate clarifications provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

4/10/2020

As responded above, Components 1 and 2 of the project are giving solutions to the main barriers identified by authorities and stakeholders to tackle the “sun and beach” tourism threats to key ecosystems in the Archipelago. The tourism plan will include regulations based on spatial analysis and carrying capacity analysis, and institutions will improve their capacities to design and implement better environmental measures, including regulations and better services of surveillance and control, based on improved information of impacts of tourism on key ecosystems and species.

As explained above, project activities won't be increasing the tourism offer, but working on existing local initiatives, to transform them into more biodiversity friendly and financially sustainable.

See improved Threat analysis, conceptual model and theory of change.

4/14/2020

Biodiversity outcomes have been highlighted in the Table B. In GEB section, qualitative information on the current biodiversity outcomes the project will produce has been included. The team has not been able to obtain quantitative data on the ecosystems' status. During PPG an assessment will be carried out to measure baseline status and project biodiversity outcome targets.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Yes. Cleared, but please recognize some of the existing design weaknesses identified above and after revising the design adjust the alignment and justification accordingly.

4/13/2020

Thank you for the revisions, clarifications, and additions. Cleared.

Agency Response

4/10/2020

Noted. The section has been updated in the PIF to reflect the revised project strategy/theory of change.

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

No. Please revise the incremental reasoning and redo the current table entirely demonstrating the global environmental benefits that will accrue from the project.

4/13/2020

Thank you for the revisions, clarifications, and additions. Cleared.

Agency Response

4/10/2020

Noted. The Incremental Cost Reasoning section in PIF was adjusted to reflect changes in revised strategy/theory of change.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

No.

First, the project refers to restoration, but no restoration target is provided, no strategy for restoration and no area per vegetation type that will be restored. Please revise.

Second, in the current design, a great deal of weight is placed on the assumed impact on a tourism plan, but it appears that core indicator 4 does not include the assumed impact of that plan when implemented under the project in terms of the areal impact of its implementation on marine habitat.

4/13/2020

Thank you for the revisions, clarifications, and additions. While this is a significant improvement on the first submission, please address these remaining issues.

Table B (as noted above) and this section on GEBs and the table that accompanies it in the PIF should include the actual conservation outcomes of the investment, that is,

1. effective management and conservation of strategic ecosystems of the archipelago, including coral reefs, seagrass, mangroves, and key protected areas: what will be the condition of the coral reefs, mangroves and key protected areas?. For protected areas we understand it will be improvement of METT scores as a proxy of improved BD condition, but for the strategic ecosystems outside of the PAs what will be the global benefit that accrues from "effective management". Please clarify.
4. increased protection of biodiversity (such as black crab, queen conch, endangered sea turtles). Will this manifest in stabilized populations or sustainable harvest? Please clarify.
5. regarding the maintenance of ecosystem services (such as erosion control, provision of food, water filtration) these are important benefits at the local level, but are not global benefits, per se, so while they should eventually be part of the project logframe they should not be listed here.
6. sustainable use of the archipelago's biodiversity in tourism activities . Please specify what biodiversity will be sustainably used and if it is of global significance. Please specify if this will be sustainable harvest of a globally important species, etc.

The following two items are not global benefits but they are some of the means by which the project will produce global benefits and should be removed from the section.

4. improved control and monitoring of the archipelago's natural resources
5. biodiversity mainstreamed into sustainable tourism planning and activities in the protected areas and three islands of the archipelago

4/14/2020

Adequate clarifications provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

4/10/2020

Noted. The references to restoration have been corrected. The project will not be doing restoration work.

Noted. This project will design the plan and begin its implementation but the impact of the plan's activities on the territory has not been attributed as the implementation of the plan's activities will not be finalized during the project lifetime.

4/14/2020

Noted. Table B has been improved to highlight the project key ecosystems benefiting from the project.

- a. 1. Agree and will be developed during project development.
- b. 4. During project implementation, an assessment of the status of the species most affected by tourism will be conducted. Based on the results of this assessment, the list of priority species to include in project activities will be selected and for each of them, specific recovery measures will be defined. The biodiversity outcomes of the project could include both stabilized populations and sustainable harvest, amongst others.

5. Agree. These have been removed.

6. Tourism activities could sustainably use, and support conservation efforts of key listed ecosystems listed. To be further developed during project development.

Agreed. These have been removed.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Please revise this entire section.

First, the project isn't innovative because it is the first potential GEF project on tourism in the Seaflower MPA and the three islands.

Second, the project fails to demonstrate any market analysis (see comments above) that identifies a unique solution, in fact what is presented so far is the development of a plan and the piloting of ecotourism as a solution, which is far from innovative given that GEF and other donors have supported similar kinds of initiatives for at least 15 years with very mixed results and the PIF doesn't demonstrate any learning from these experiences or any advancement on this strategic approach.

Thus, after the project design is revised, please update this section on innovation.

Regarding sustainability, this is also a weak justification. Tourism that is environmentally and economically sustainable for the private sector will be what sustains this investment, but there is no evidence of any private sector involvement and consultation thus far on the proposed design solution. Please revise this section after the project design is revised.

The section on potential for scaling up is also weak, please revise. The project design provides limited evidence that what is proposed will be a model for tourism that others will want to replicate given its limited innovation.

4/13/2020

Thank you for the revisions, clarifications, and additions. Cleared.

Agency Response

4/10/2020

Noted. Section has been revised and corrected.

Noted. Clarified in the text and in the comments above. Additionally, the PPG phase will be an opportunity to perform more in depth analysis of the tourism sector and further refine the project strategy and theory of change.

Noted. CORALINA and MADS have had extensive engagement with the tourism private sector, including in the context of the POMIUAC, and this ensures continued participation of the private sector in the next steps of the POMIUAC, including the development of the tourism chapter plan the project proposes. However,

recognizing that private sector engagement, specifically in the context of the PIF development has been limited, the PPG will place special emphasis on ensuring their active participation in the different phases of project development and also during project implementation, specifically through the interinstitutional coordination group created to advise and accompany the design and implementation of the sustainable tourism plan.

Noted. The section has been strengthened.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/13/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Yes for the most part, but the PIF does not discuss what engagement has taken place with the private sector, who are the key partners in the proposed initiative. Please clarify.

4/13/2020

Thank you for the revisions, clarifications, and additions. Cleared.

Agency Response

4/10/2020

Responded above.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Yes; however, it appears that there has not been any consultation with the private sector on the focus of the PIF, nor is the private sector providing any cofinancing to the project. Thus, while the project's success depends on private sector collaboration of many sizes of tourism enterprise, the PIF provides no evidence that this has been undertaken to help identify the project strategy. Please clarify.

4/13/2020

Thank you for the revisions, clarifications, and additions. Cleared.

Agency Response

4/10/2020

Responded above. Agreed on the importance of the private sector collaboration. The project team will develop a stakeholder engagement plan for the PPG phase, that will place special emphasis to ensure the participation of a solid representation of the tourism private sector in the different phases of the project development.

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Yes, for the most part.

Climate change is expected to influence temperatures in Colombia, and rainfall and extreme weather events are expected to be variable across different climate zones but the PIF provides no information on how this is integrated into the project design for the tourism plan and its implementation, new policies regarding infrastructure, restoration and management of the key ecosystems, etc.

Please provide details on how the project activities being funded by this investment will deal with the climate stressors and risks that are likely to impact the project outcomes.

4/13/2020

Thank you for the revisions, clarifications, and additions. Please reflect on the implications of COVID-19 and how the impact on tourism may be accommodated in the project design and implementation phase as a risk to be managed.

Please also attach the preliminary safeguard screening document.

4/14/2020

Adequate clarifications on most items. However, while information has been provided in section 5 indicating that safeguards categorization and screening will be undertaken during project development, WWF should be able at this stage, in line with GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards, to provide some preliminary information on environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the proposed project including measures to address such risks and impacts. If possible, please attach preliminary ESS screening reports.

4/17/2020

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

4/10/2020

Noted. Information on how climate change will be integrated in the project has been indicated in the PIF, including revised risks section. However, this will be further developed during PPG.

4/14/2020

A reflection on the implications of COVID – 19 on the project has been included in the Risks section

Preliminary safeguard screening documents are not available at this stage. The project will develop preliminary safeguard assessment during early stages of PPG phase.

4/17/2020

Noted. The PIF was revised to include text in the Risks section based on a preliminary assessment based on the available knowledge of activities/outputs, which at this stage, is very high level. Under WWF's Policy of Environmental and Social Risk Management, the safeguards screening is done by the project team during Project Development Phase, once activities are well defined, as our screening tool is a detailed exercise. That is why the screening tool at this moment is not provided.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/27/2020

No. The PIF as currently designed does not provide a comprehensive and sufficient response to the existing and potential future threats posed by tourism to globally important biodiversity in the project sites. Please make the requested revisions including reformulating the theory of change to inform a robust re-design of the initiative and resubmit including more participation of the private sector in all its manifestations.

4/13/2020

Thank you for the revisions, clarifications, and additions. While the submission is a vast improvement on the first draft, some critical issues remain to be resolved prior to being recommended for clearance. Please review the comments above, revise the PIF and resubmit as soon as possible.

4/14/2020

Adequate clarifications have been provided on almost all issues with sufficient detail. Please address the final comment on ESS risks as noted above.

4/17/2020

Yes, PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/14/2020

A number of issues related to metrics, indicators and the conservation outcomes have been identified as critical design elements to be fully addressed and resolved in the project design phase. Please ensure that adequate attention is paid to these topics in the first three months of the PPG.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The project “Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the tourism sector of the protected areas and strategic ecosystems of San Andres, Old Providence and Santa Catalina islands” seeks to promote biodiversity conservation mainstreaming in the tourism sector in the Archipelago through the design and implementation of participatory governance models and effective policies, management of tourism impacts on key ecosystems and species, and transforming existing local tourism activities into culturally-rich and biodiversity friendly and sustainable products.

The strengthening of capacities and the inter-institutional articulation with the small-scale private sector, as well as the first-hand knowledge of the impacts produced by tourism on biodiversity, will allow informed decision-making and the participatory implementation of measures for the effective management of ecosystems and their respective conservation. Likewise, the support and strengthening of biodiversity friendly and culturally-rich local tourism initiatives - based on the principles established by the national government regarding green businesses - will promote a change in the local tourism sector towards one that not only has an impact on conservation but also is an agent of change that can be used in favor of biodiversity.

The underlying theory of change of the project is: If the ecological, social and economic attributes of the Archipelago (San Andrés, Old Providence and Santa Catalina) are to be preserved, then an innovative model for sustainable tourism needs to be implemented in which there is (i) a consolidation of sustainable tourism as a strategic part of the Integrated Management Plan of the Coastal Environment; (ii) strengthening of authorities' capacities and equipment for taking appropriate environmental measures and enforcing regulations that protect biodiversity; (iii) reliable, scientific information about tourism impacts on key biodiversity and institutional capacities developed to guide management and mitigation actions based on this information to reduce threats; and (iv) local tourism initiatives in the Archipelago transformed into biodiversity friendly and financially sustainable businesses.

The global environmental benefits of the project will be 108 hectares of terrestrial protected areas under improved management for conservation and sustainable use; 11,817 hectares of marine protected areas under improved management for conservation and sustainable use, and 4,363 hectares of landscapes under improved practices (excluding protected areas).