



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

Energy Efficiency for the Transition to Carbon Neutral Cities in Colombia

Basic Information

GEF ID

10917

Countries

Colombia

Project Title

Energy Efficiency for the Transition to Carbon Neutral Cities in Colombia

GEF Agency(ies)

CAF, IADB

Agency ID

CAF: CAF-GEF-035, IADB: IDB-000

GEF Focal Area(s)

Climate Change

Program Manager

Patricia Marcos Huidobro

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

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

3/14/2022 PM:

Cleared.

1/26/2022 PM:

No. The project is expected to provide support to the design and implementation of centralized systems for household's projects and public spaces. Since the use of solar photovoltaic panels is envisioned under the project, then, Table A of the GEF Portal Entry shall also include objective "*CCM-1-1- Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs for decentralized power with energy usage*".

Agency Response

Agency Response 2/23/2022

Table A in the PIF has been updated to include CCM-1-1.

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

3/28/2022 PM:

Cleared.

3/14/2022 PM:

No. Table B is still showing Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.3 as Investment Activities instead of Technical Assistance. Please update column "Financing Type" for these two outputs.

1/26/2022 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

-All outputs under Component 2 have been tagged as "Investment". However, outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.3 shall be tagged as Technical Assistance activities rather than Investment. Please update the table accordingly, and tagged each output individually.

- The objective of the project is "Contribute to a reduction of CO₂ emissions by increasing energy efficiency in the construction sector in Barranquilla, Montería and Pasto through the development of actions that involve the different stages of the life cycle of buildings and interventions in public space". However, this objectives does not match the objective under Section 3 of the GEF Portal Entry "Contribute to a reduction of CO₂ emissions by increasing decarbonization strategies in buildings and public spaces in Barranquilla, Montería and Pasto through the development of actions that involve the different stages of the life cycle of buildings and interventions in public space'. Please make the objective consistent across the document.

Agency Response

Agency Response 2/23/2022

Output 2.1.1 and Output 2.1.3 in the updated PIF are now classified as Technical Assistance (TA).

Section 3 of the GEF Portal Entry has been updated to ensure consistency across the document.

Agency Response: 3/18/2022

Each output in Component 2 in Table B has now been labelled as either TA or INV, as suggested by the GEF Secretariat and has been updated in the GEF Portal.

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

3/14/2022 PM:

Cleared.

1/26/2022 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- Under the co-financing Table C the "Barranquilla City Council" appeared twice, i.e. USD 33,048,785 and USD 28,571,061, both amounts as "Investment Mobilized". Please explain why there are two different contributions from the same entity or update if need be.

- The following financier name seems to be mistaken "Ministry of Environment – Montería City Council". Please clarify or update accordingly.

- The explanation under Table C on how any investment mobilized has been identified provides information that is not required for this project. For instance, it provides information on which activities will be funded with the co-financing sources (i.e. restoration, botanical garden, etc.). Since the explanation provided is too long, we suggest to delete the description of the activities that will be implemented with the co-financing, and just focus on describing which as the co-financiers, the type of resources they are providing and how they were

identified.

Agency Response

Agency Response 2/23/2022

The Co-financing Table in the PIF has been updated to eliminate duplication of co-financing source (Baranquilla City Council) and to eliminate possible confusion regarding the source of the co-financing (Ministry of Environment – Montería City Council).

The text under Table C has been substantially reduced in the updated PIF, limiting reference to type of co-financing and source.

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

3/14/2022 PM:

Cleared.

1/26/2022 PM:

No. Please note that the proposed GEF financing is not in line with the GEF financing requested in the LoE. Please update the documents accordingly.

Agency Response

Agency Response 2/23/2022

The Letter of Endorsement has been updated to align with GEF Resources Requested as per Tables D & E of the PIF.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1/26/2022 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response

No agency response required.

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1/26/2022 PM:

N/A

Agency Response

No agency response required.

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1/26/2022 PM:

N/A

Agency Response

No agency response required.

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1/26/2022 PM:

N/A

Agency Response

No agency response required.

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1/26/2022 PM:

N/A

Agency Response

Agency Response

No agency response required.

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1/26/2022 PM:

N/A

Agency Response

No agency response required.

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

1/26/2022 PM:

Yes, the PPG requested is within the allowable cap.

Agency Response

No agency response required.

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/10/2022 PM:

Cleared.

3/28/2022 PM:

Cleared, with comments. The excel sheet with the GHG calculations uploaded to the GEF portal does not allowed a proper tracker of the estimations. Please upload the second excel sheet (provided earlier via email) and whenever possible combined both sheets in one.

3/14/2022 PM:

No. Please provide the excel sheet for the calculation of the ERs. From the description provided in the annex, it if difficult to trace the date.

1/26/2022 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- The GHG estimations, as per the GEF GHG methodology, shall consider the GHG to be achieved by the project, including those activities covered by the co-financing resources. Please re-assess the GHG estimations and consider including GHG emissions from the broader project.
- Overall, the proposed assumptions and the replication factor look good. Also, do you expect the EE measures (once the legislation has been improved and updated thanks to Component 1) to be replicated not only in the three cities where the pilots will be implemented but to the other 11 cities that are part of the broader Biodiverciudades initiative or event to other cities across the country (even if they are not part of the Biodiverciudades initiative)? We understand this shall be the case given that the proposed EE measures are expected to be adopted by the national government. If this assumption is correct, then the indirect ER from Output 2.1.2 would significantly increase.

- As for GHG from Output 2.1.3 please provide an explanation on why indirect GHG have not been calculated. An estimation of the indirect GHG would be welcome, even if this just an assumption based on the type of pilots or projects expected.

Agency Response

Agency Response: 2/23/2022

In the investigation carried out to calculate emissions, no additional projects were found to those presented in the calculation report, that are co-financed and could report a GHG reduction. However, it is important to note that for the construction of the public spaces detailed in Output 2.1.3, different sources available to the cities will be used; in the calculation report these calculations are detailed.

Indeed, the implementation of energy efficiency regulation in buildings will be at the national level, therefore, it is considered that the 11 other cities that are part of the Biodivercities initiative also have the potential to contribute to the reduction of emissions. The calculation is adjusted according to the above to obtain a new GHG mitigation result and reflected in Section F of the PIF.

Indirect GHG emissions were not calculated in the previous version, since, as can be seen in the calculation file, each energy efficiency project in public spaces differs from city to city in its size and nature. However, if there is the flexibility to consider a type of project that could be implemented in the different cities, it is possible that an important number of projects of distributed solar energy could comply with the provisions of Laws 1715 of 2014 and 1931 of 2018, regarding the implementation of renewable energies in the public sector. Therefore, the calculation of indirect GHG reductions has been adjusted, to consider these PV projects that will be installed in the cities.

Agency Response: 3/18/2022

The Excel file with CO2 calculations is now included as Annex G to the PIF. Additional text summarizing the assumptions and dates has been added to the PIF, just below the matrix which contains the Core Indicators (Section F).

Agency Response: 4/05/2022

The Annex G, which included the second Excel sheet, has been uploaded to the portal.

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

1/26/2022 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response No agency response required.

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

3/28/2022 PM:

No. As per this section, the total indirect GHG emission reductions from the project is 305,557 tCO₂eq, while the project is claiming indirect GHG emission reductions under Indicator 6 of 1,236,353 tCO₂eq . Please clarify and/or amend this inconsistency.

3/14/2022 PM:

Cleared.

1/26/2022 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- Under Barrier 1 it is mentioned that "Likewise, E2050 proposes to develop reporting and verification mechanisms to guarantee the implementation of norms, standards and protocols for sustainable energy efficient buildings and net zero emissions". However, it is not clear whether this has been achieved or not, and if not please explain the barriers from preventing this.

- Clarify and elaborate on Barrier 2, it is not clear what the barrier is about.

- Overall, the context shall be further elaborated particularly from the governance point of view, where it seems to lay the main innovativeness of the project. The explanation shall be linked to the outputs proposed under Component 1, so there is a better link between the activities proposed and the national context explanation. For instance, the documents fails to explain why there is a need to update legislation from 2015. as well as for an MRV system. why EE is not picking up in the country despite the numerous projects that have been

regulation from 2016, as well as for an energy system, why it is not picking up in the country despite the numerous projects that have been implemented, why it is important to involve the financial sector, etc.

Agency Response

Agency Response: 2/23/2022

Barrier 1 has been expanded and clarified. Barrier 2 has been eliminated, since on a further in-depth review, it was decided that the points raised in that barrier were not substantive enough and are indirectly addressed under Barrier 1 with the proposed reforms to the governance (legal and institutional) framework for the construction sector. The overall 'governance context' section in the PIF has been expanded and strengthened regarding E2050, Resolution 549 of 2015, the need for an MRV, overall challenges of energy efficiency in the construction sector in Colombia, and the role of the financial sector.

Agency Response: 4/05/2022

The information on page 29 of the PIF has been updated to indicate 51,998 direct and 1,184,355 indirect GHG emission reductions. This has also been adjusted in the Core Indicator Worksheet and the GEF Portal.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/14/2022 PM:

Cleared, with suggestions. Thank you for the clarification provided to the first comment below. Please add a this explanation in the proposal to help clarify that the government is committing to guarantee the identification of 6,024 housing pilot projects at the city level, complementary to the projects presented as counterpart, which as mentioned are Ciénaga de Mallorquín Family Ecopark, Caño la Ahuyama, and those mentioned for Pasto and Montería. It is necessary to clarify that these 6,024 pilot projects will be identified after the presentation of the project, being supported in addition to the relationship and work with the cities and the figures provided by the National Department of Statistics (DANE), which between 2015 and 2019 show that Barranquilla, Montería and Pasto are among the 20 cities with the largest number of square meters of buildings built in the country.

1/26/2022 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- We understand the project plans on developed 6,024 new energy efficiency household pilots in the three selected cities. However, while going through the projects identified for each city, only Pasto seems to include a housing project (i.e. Environmental, landscape and architectural recovery of the Pasto River as a structuring and connecting element of development and urban housing in the city of San Juan de Pasto). Please explain how the selected pilots for Baranquilla, i.e. Eco Park Family Distric Ciénaga de Mallorquin and Recovery of the Cano de la Ahuyama plan on developing new households. Also, do the same for Monteria.

- Associated baseline projects: please include also a project developed by the IFC through which they implemented the EDGE in a number of Colombian cities (DNP could provide further information on this project), as well as the Neto Zero Carbon Building Accelerator by WRI and the GEF, the Guide to Sustainability Criteria for Social Housing in Colombia, by MVCT, DNP and GIZ, and the Systemic Perspectives on Low-carbon Cities in Colombia- An integrated Urban Modeling Approach for Policy and Regulatory Analysis by Universidad de los Andes and UK-PACT Colombia.

Agency Response

Agency Response: 2/23/2022

Currently, the Biodivercities Initiative, led by the national government, has managed to form a network of 14 Colombian cities that have ratified, through a memorandum of understanding, their commitment to incorporate biodiversity into the urban development of cities. This memorandum provides a framework of work and understanding with the cities, with which we have been able to identify 94 urban development projects and leverage with resources from the national government 2 projects in Barranquilla for USD 50 million and 4 projects of national scale of technical assistance. This commitment of the cities to the initiative has managed to generate coordinated work that has allowed for the formulation of an energy efficiency project with resources from the GEF, which is why the government is committing to guarantee the identification of 6,024 housing pilot projects at the city level, complementary to the projects presented as counterpart, which as mentioned are Ciénaga de Mallorquín Family Ecopark, Caño la Ahuyama, and those mentioned for Pasto and Montería.

It is necessary to clarify that these 6,024 pilot projects will be identified after the presentation of the project, being supported in addition to the relationship and work with the cities and the figures provided by the National Department of Statistics (DANE), which between 2015 and 2019 show that Barranquilla, Montería and Pasto are among the 20 cities with the largest number of square meters of buildings built in the country. In the case of Barranquilla, a construction of more than 6 million m2 of buildings is reported in the aforementioned period, Pasto reports more than 1 million m2 and Montería more than 600 thousand m2, this, together with the statistics provided by the Ministry of Housing, which reported the sale of more than 221,000 homes throughout Colombia in 2021, makes it feasible to achieve these pilot projects complementary to those presented as counterpart, which would apply the energy efficiency proposals proposed in the GEF project.

In terms of the additional baseline projects, these have been added to the baseline scenario section of the PIF.

Agency Response: 3/18/2022

The baseline section of the PIF has been updated to clarify that these 6,024 pilot projects will be identified after the presentation of the project, being supported in addition to the relationship and work with the cities and the figures provided by the National Department of Statistics (DANE), which between 2015 and 2019 show that Barranquilla, Montería and Pasto are among the 20 cities with the largest number of square meters of buildings built in the country.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/14/2022 PM:

Cleared.

1/26/2022 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- The innovativeness of the project seems to come primarily from Component 1. As such, this component shall be further elaborated and include more comprehensive information for each of the outputs included. For instance, elaborate further on each of the 6 outputs identified in Table B of the Portal Entry, such as the need for it, objective, scope, stakeholders, responsible party, etc.
- Component 1 is expected to develop 3 guidance manuals. However, it is not clear to which of the 6 outputs would these manuals belongs to. For ease of clarify, please organize this component by output.
- Please note that GEF7 Biodiverciudades is not a GEF project. Please update the following sentence accordingly: "The objective will be to create two financing mechanisms to guarantee the replicability and expansion of the scope of GEF 7 of BiodiverCiudades".
- As for the development of a financing mechanism, please explore engaging with FINDETER (and including them in the list of stakeholders) since they work closely with municipalities and have previous experience with energy efficiency projects.
- Component 2 includes that "... under the guidance of resolution 0549 of 2015...". However, it is our understanding from the proposal that this resolution would be updated with contributions from proposed project. Please clarify in the proposal if this is the case and, if so, we are

wondering whether it shall be rephrased along these lines "under the guidance of the updated resolution...".

- Component 2 mentions that "used solar PV panels will be disposed and/or recycled in accordance with national laws and regulations". Please clarify which national laws and regulations are in place in Colombia, and include this as a potential environmental risk under the risk assessment section.

Agency Response

Agency Response: 2/23/2022

A table has been added to Component 1 which highlights the needs, objectives, scope, and key players/stakeholder for each output of the component.

Reference to the 'GEF 7 Biodiverciudades' within the context of the comment made by the GEF Secretariat has been corrected in the description of Outcome 1.1 in the PIF.

FINDETER is now clearly identified as a key player in the proposed financial mechanism.

Even though the project will be articulated with resolution 549 of 2015 of the Ministry of Housing of Colombia, the regulatory framework on which the regulatory update that will finance the project will be developed will be National Decree 1077 of 2015 that compiles all the regulations of the Housing Sector, City, and Territory of Colombia. Therefore, the phrase should be guided by the updating of the regulatory framework defined in National Decree 1077 of 2015. This latter national decree has been added to the text in Component 2 for clarity.

The specific decree governing the disposal of waste (photovoltaic cells) has been included in the description of Component 2 in the PIF.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/14/2022 PM:

Cleared.

1/26/2022 PM:

No. The project is expected to provide support to the design and implementation of centralized systems for household's projects and public spaces. Since the use of solar photovoltaic panels is envisioned under the project, then, the GEF Portal Entry shall also include objective "*CCM-1-1- Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs for decentralized power with energy usage*", in addition to CCM-1-3.

Agency Response

Agency Response: 2/23/2022

CCM-1-1 has been included in Table A of the PIF.

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

1/26/2022 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response No agency response required.

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

3/28/2022 PM:

Cleared, with comments. The excel sheet with the GHG calculations uploaded to the GEF portal does not allowed a proper tracker of the estimations. Please upload the second excel sheet (provided earlier via email) and whenever possible combined both sheets in just one.

3/14/2022 PM:

No. Please provide the excel sheet for the calculation of the ERs. From the description provided in the annex, it is difficult to trace the date.

1/26/2022 PM:

No. Please see previous comment on GHG emissions. Overall the GHG emissions reductions projected by the project seem achievable but too low. Please re-assess the estimation as per the previous comment.

Agency Response

Agency Response: 2/23/2022

According to the clarifications above on the GHG reduction calculation, direct + indirect reductions of 1,236,354 tons of CO2e are obtained by the project.

Agency Response: 3/18/2022

The Excel file with CO2 calculations is now included as Annex G to the PIF. Additional text summarizing the assumptions and dates has been added to the PIF, just below the matrix which contains the Core Indicators (Section F).

Agency Response: 4/05/2022

The Annex G, which included the second Excel sheet, has been uploaded to the portal.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/14/2022 PM:

Cleared.

1/26/2022 PM:

Yes, with request for clarifications. The Portal entry states that "used solar PV panels will be disposed and/or recycled in accordance with national laws and regulations". Please clarify which national laws and regulations are in place in Colombia, and include this as a potential environmental risk under the risk assessment section.

Agency Response

Agency Response: 2/23/2022

The specific law is Decree 4741 of 2005 - "By which the prevention and management of hazardous waste generated within the framework of comprehensive management is partially regulated". This has been added to the description of Component 2 and has been added to the risk assessment section.

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

1/26/2022 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response No agency response required.

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

3/14/2022 PM:

Cleared.

1/26/2022 PM:

No. We suggest the team to increase the list of stakeholders for the project, particularly to include stakeholders that may be relevant for the development of the project such as the Ministry of Mines and Energy, UPME, DNP, FINDETER and others.

Agency Response

Agency Response: 2/23/2022

The matrix in the stakeholders' section of the PIF has been updated to include additional actors that are key to the project's success.

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

1/26/2022 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response No agency response required.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/14/2022 PM:

Cleared.

1/26/2022 PM:

No. Please explain why this section is missing a reference to the financial sector, which will play a key role in the development of potential financial mechanisms of energy efficiency projects and the development of a financing strategy (i.e. output 1.6). Update the section accordingly if need be.

Agency Response

Agency Response: 2/23/2022

The role of the financial sector in the proposed financial mechanisms has been added to the Private Sector Engagement section of the PIF.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

3/14/2022 PM:

Cleared.

1/26/2022 PM:

Yes, with further suggestions:

- Under environmental risks, please add the risk of solar panels being improperly disposed and how to handle this risks;
- Covid Risk have been properly addressed. However, please elaborate further on COVID opportunities, i.e. ensure clear articulation of how the proposed project will help in reducing the risk of emerging infectious diseases in the future, while increasing the resilience of the socio-economy systems, including innovation in climate change mitigation and resilience, and engagement with the private sector.

Agency Response

Agency Response: 2/23/2022

The disposal of used solar panels has been added to the risk assessment section, as well additional text to the COVID 19 risk section to reflect climate-smart construction to enhance levels of preparedness, reduction of risks, and increased resilience for future pandemics if they should arise and to the effects of climate change.

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

1/26/2022 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response No agency response required.

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

3/14/2022 PM:

Cleared.

1/26/2022 PM:

Yes, with request for clarifications. Under the ENEC (National Circular Economy Strategy), we suggest to remove the paragraph below since the GEF-finance portion of the project does not deal with construction materials:

This project is articulated with the National Circular Economy Strategy in its two components; Component 1 "Governance for sustainable construction", through the development of one of the practical guides, which will deal with construction materials; Likewise, within the plans for decarbonization of buildings and public space, principles of circularity will be considered. Component 2 "Net zero carbon buildings and energy efficiency in public spaces" since the pilots to be co-financed and implemented will consider the processes of use and reincorporation of construction and demolition waste in the life cycle of buildings.

Agency Response

Agency Response: 2/23/2022

The paragraph referenced above has been removed from the PIF.

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

3/14/2022 PM:

Cleared.

1/26/2022 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- Please spell out acronyms PSC (Project Steering Committee) and TAC since they have not been previously spelt out in the GEF Portal Entry.
- Please clarify who will be responsible for managing and updating the project-specific website.

Agency Response

Agency Response: 2/21/2022

The PSC acronym has been defined in the text of the PIF. The project’s website will be updated by the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development and the Colombian Council for Sustainable Construction.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1/26/2022 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response No agency response required.

art 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

3/14/2022 PM:

Cleared.

1/26/2022 PM:

No. Please note that the GEF financing as per the LOE is not in line with the GEF financing as per the GEF Portal Entry document. Please update the Portal Entry Document and/or the LoE accordingly.

Agency Response

1/26/2022 PM:

Agency Response: 2/23/2022

The information has been updated in the GEF Portal

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

1/26/2022 PM:

N/A

Agency Response

No agency response required.

EFSEC 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

4/19/2022 PM:

Cleared.

4/15/2022 PM:

We understand there are two executing agencies for this project: the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development and the Colombian Council for Sustainable Construction. If this correct, please clarify it in the information sheet at the beginning of the PIF under "Executing Partner Type", by for instance indicating "Government / CSO".

3/14/2022 PM:

Cleared with comments. Please upload the second excel sheet (provided earlier via email) and whenever possible combined both sheets in just one. Also, in section "6. Global Environmental Benefits" the total indirect GHG emission reductions from the project is 305,557 tCO₂eq, while the project is claiming indirect GHG emission reductions under Indicator 6 of 1,236,353 tCO₂eq . Please clarify and/or amend this inconsistency.

3/14/2022 PM:

Please address the pending comment: "Table B is still showing Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.3 as Investment Activities instead of Technical Assistance. Please update column "Financing Type" for these two outputs" and provide the excel sheet for the calculation of the emission reductions.

1/26/2022 PM:

No. The GEF Sec is returning the project to the Agency to address further comments.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		1/7/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)		2/24/2022
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