



Life Amazon: Forest and biodiversity conservation and community-led sustainable management in the Colombian Amazon

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11201

Countries

Colombia

Project Name

Life Amazon: Forest and biodiversity conservation and community-led sustainable management in the Colombian Amazon

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

9/12/2024

Review completed by PM

9/25/2024

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
September 24, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response Thank you.

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
September 24, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response Thank you.

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
September 24, 2024:

Please add a short paragraph informing of the expected results in terms of core indicators.

October 23, 2024:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you.

The following paragraph has been added as requested in the project summary: *"The project will achieve the improvement of the management of approximately 8.06 million hectares of terrestrial protected areas, the improvement of practices within an area of 3.92 million hectares and restoration of 8,000 hectares, while benefiting over 48 thousand people, of which 45% identifies as a woman. The actions developed by the project will support the mitigation of GHG, which will result in the 22.4 million metric tons of CO₂e mitigated."*

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?
- c) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
- e) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- f) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 24, 2024:

a) and b) Yes, cleared.

c)

c.1. Please include a number indicator for each component. Currently only component 4 has this indicator.

c.2. In the Child Project Description Overview table, it is unclear which output contribute to which outcome. Please provide a numbering of the outputs that clearly shows the outcome they are contributing to.

c.3. The outputs 2.5 and 2.6 seem to be repeated ("Degraded areas in key corridors under restoration processes") and they are not identified as 2 separate "actions" in the project description. Please clarify and be consistent in the Child Project Description Overview table and in the project description.

c.4. In general, the number of outputs appears very limited, in particular in components 3 and 4. Some outputs appear to be achieved with only one outcome. Please clarify the project content considering more outputs contributing to the outcomes.

d) The Child Project Description Overview table doesn't include any gender consideration. While gender is strongly taken into account in the submission package, please make it also explicit in the Child Project Description Overview table and in the description of the components.

e) Yes, cleared

f) Yes, the PMC equal to 5% for FSP. Cleared.

October 23, 2024:

c) and d) Thank you for the amendments and consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

c.1. Component numbers added as requested. The team has added in the table for Project Description Overview the indicators agreed with the government that will measure compliance with the outcomes as included in the results framework. As per policies, a results framework has been established with the key SMART indicators at PDO level and per component (not expected to match each output). Also note that as per WB guidance, activities for component 4 for example doing effective management and monitoring are compulsory so no need to add as target, and the WB evaluates and rates performance biannually.

c.2. Numbers have been adjusted as required but please note that some outputs contribute to several outcomes. Expected outcomes per component were not established on a one-by-one basis but understanding the overall expected mid-term goals per component.

c.3. Thank you for highlighting this typo. It has been fixed.

c.4. The table for the project overview summarized the project description with expected outcomes and key outputs. To achieve these outcomes and outputs there is a series of interrelated activities. Each output is achieved by a series of activities, and several of these contribute to expected outcomes per component (mid-term objectives). A more detailed explanation of the components and its activities has been included in the project description. The nature of the project requires flexibility and adaptive management in the specific activities as per implementation progresses and lessons are learnt.

d. Along the paragraph, the following sentences have been added: *?The project will promote the participation of women in the design and implementation of the different activities established in each component, ensuring that there are adequate mechanisms for their participation and taking into consideration the role that women play in resource management, conservation, and sustainable*

development. The project will support the strengthening of the governance of women organizations and women within local communities and Indigenous Peoples, to ensure their voices are heard in planning processes, addressing key issues such as food security, education, and income generation. Through component 1 and 2, the project will ensure that women are part of the ecological restoration processes, with special emphasis on restoration to achieve food security, as well as implementation of the different area-based management plans. Capacities will be built within women's organizations for their integration into value chains, providing them with support in the commercialization of non-forest timber and timber forest products. This includes training and access to financial instruments for women-led businesses. Through component 3 and 4, the project will promote the strengthening of capacities of women in conservation, including: ensuring the participation of women in dialogue processes, improvement of capacities to conduct and monitor project activities, integrating women's traditional knowledge, training women through citizen science processes, to strengthen and contribute to forest monitoring processes, generating gender-sensitive information, among others?.

In addition, in the more detailed description of the project, further gender and youth considerations have been included. The Gender Plan has been uploaded.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?**
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
September 24, 2024:

a)

a.1. In the review form, there is no section "A. Project Rationale". The description begins with an incomplete sentence beginning with "threatens globally important biodiversity and the ecological landscape connectivity...". While in the pdf view, the section "A. Project Rationale" exists but it is the section "B. Child Project Description" that begins with the same incomplete sentence. It can be a Portal issue but please check if the 2 different sections "A. Project Rationale" and "B. Child Project Description" are properly filled out with their relevant paragraphs.

a.2. The importance of past GEF interventions is mentioned but it is unclear how this project builds in particular on the results of the previous phases ASL1 and ASL2. In the rationale description, please make explicit how this new phase of the ASL builds on the experiences and results of the previous phases of the ASL.

b) Please see comment below in 5.1 i).

c) N/A

October 23, 2024:

Thank you for the clarification and additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

a.1. Thanks. This has been fixed.

a.2. We have added lessons learned from past GEF projects indicating how will be incorporated in the Life Amazon project. Past GEF projects are part of ASL1 and ASL2, so this has been clarified.

b) comments addressed in 5.1 below.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?

d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

h) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

j) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to

project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

k) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 24, 2024:

a) The presentation of the TOC includes a diagram but the narrative is unclear. Please elaborate clearly on the project logic including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective through the identified causal pathways, and identify the key assumptions.

b) Yes, cleared.

c) Partially. As mentioned above, explicit and clear description on how the GEF alternative will build on ASL1 and ASL2 need to be provided.

d)

d.1. The description of the components is succinct, sometimes just listing the outputs. The outcomes are not clearly identified as they appear in the Child Project Description Overview table. Please elaborate further and clearly in the description of the components including the outcomes, the outputs and the activities under the outputs. Please ensure this description is consistent with the Child Project Description Overview table.

d.2. The action (b) of component 1 (participatory design and implementation of culturally appropriate management plans for selected ITs) seems very similar to the action (b) of the component 2 (participatory design and implementation ... of forestry and biodiversity management plans). Please clarify the difference in the description.

d.3 The action (c) of component 1 (active and passive restoration inside PAs, ITs and buffer zones) seems similar to the action (e) of the component 2 (restoration of key areas with the purpose of restoring connectivity...). Please clarify the difference in the description.

e) Yes, if the added value to ASL1 and ASL2 is clarified. Cleared.

f) The socio-economic benefits are mentioned but they not clearly described in the Project Description (as well as in the PAD and ESS documents). Please include in Portal entry a brief description of the expected socio-economic benefits.

g) The cost of "Office supplies" and "Operational costs (office, administrative expenses)" should be entirely charged to PMC unless clearly justified by specific and limited activities related to components. Please amend and clarify accordingly.

h) Improving the governance and management, enhancing capacity, restoration activities, improving livelihoods and project monitoring in selected key areas is expected to ensure resilience to future changes and adaptive management. Cleared.

i) The relevant stakeholders and their roles should be adequately described within the components' description. Please complete accordingly.

j)

j.1. We don't find the Gender analysis and its findings are not clearly taken into consideration in components' design and description. Please provide the Gender analysis and clarify the components description as needed.

j.2. In developing sustainable land management frameworks, please ensure women's and women's organizations' meaningful engagements in committees and capacity-building activities.

j.3. In Component 2, there are entry points to promote women's empowerment, such as new entrepreneurship and employment opportunities for women in forestry and bioeconomy activities. The Agency may wish to connect with World Bank's Women Entrepreneurs Finance Initiative (We-Fi) www.we-fi.org for relevant interlinkages with Component 2.

j.4. Please ensure that all KM products and activities capture good practices and lessons learned from a gender perspective and on M&E, and please reflect that gender-related indicators are monitored and results reported on.

k) Yes, cleared.

l) The description do intend to enhance policy coherence promoting dialogue and coordination between the different sectors intervening in the project area. Nevertheless it is unclear if there are policies, regulations or subsidies that could counteract the intended project outcomes. Please clarify if such policies, regulations or subsidies exist.

m) Yes, cleared.

October 23, 2024:

a), c) d) and f) Thank you for the additional information and clarification. Cleared.

g) Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

i) Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

j) Thank you for uploading the Gender action plan and for the clarification. Cleared.

l) Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

a) The narrative of the ToC that is graphically depicted has been improved in the Section A. project description. In addition, project subcomponents better match with the ToC outputs and the outcomes have been included.

c) Detailed information has been added regarding how the project will build on the previous GEF projects, including those that are part of ASL 1 and ASL2.

d)

d.1. Detailed description has been added to the components. Each project component description includes the expected outcomes (mid-term objectives) that are in the Overview table, and then for each output a description of the activities has been included. There is now consistency between the Child project description overview table and the project description.

d.2. The action b from component 1 refers to the Management Plans developed by Indigenous Peoples within their territories, following their traditional practices and ancestral connection with the territories. On the other hand, the actions proposed in section b of component 2 refers to the Management Plans that will be developed within the Nuclei of Forestry and Biodiversity (NDFyB) which are part of the national strategy to contain deforestation. These management plans are implemented by campesino communities and relate to the sustainable value chains for timber and non-timber forest products. These activities will happen in production landscapes (component 2) of high deforestation outside of protected landscapes included indigenous territories and protected areas (component 1). Added details of component description will clarify. Also, there is a section that describes the distinct areas of intervention.

d.3. Restoration activities under component 1 will be developed within PAs and ITs, following the culturally appropriate procedures and guidance when happening in protected territories. Restoration under component 2 will happen outside these areas and in more degraded areas. This distinction is necessary to remain within the project's overall rationale and also as the institutions in charge of each restoration process will be different.

f) Socioeconomic benefits have been identified in the project description in addition to a specific paragraph highlighting key one. The project will provide multiple socio-economic benefits to the diverse set of stakeholders (including all gender identities), from public institutions, local communities, indigenous people and afro descendants to the broader public. Key benefits include strengthened governance, capacities, and social capital within local communities and technical offices within the environmental public system; increased food security and livelihoods; increased income and employment through participation in bioeconomy value chains with improved production

practices and market access; enhanced recognition and value of traditional knowledge and culturally appropriate management practices.

g) The Budget has been adjusted. The expenses that were marked as operational costs and supplies for components referred more to expenses related to technical workshops and training which now has been appropriately allocated. This review allowed for better adjustments from the government counterparts.

i) Adding more details in project description gives more information of the role of stakeholders. The project will have a long-lasting impact on local communities, Indigenous Peoples, women organizations in the Amazon and the Colombian government, as it will continue providing support to the strategies need to contain deforestation, foster sustainable development, support the decarbonization of Colombian economy, among others. For Indigenous Peoples, the project will provide resources to support the strengthening of their government structures, which will also impact the managing strategies for their land.

j)

j.1. The Gender action plan has been updated in the portal. The team has added specific gender sensitive actions within the description of the project.

j.2. This has been considered for the project. The updated project description clearly specifies women involvement. In line with a broader approach, distinctive activities will also be targeted for youth (i.e. restoration, agroforestry, etc.) and older adults (e.g. recovery of traditional knowledge)

j.3. Thanks for the recommendation and the team will connect with We-Fi.

j.4. The team will ensure KM products and activities capture previous lessons in multiple technical aspects including gender. We have added in the document a set of key lessons, including those from the analysis conducted in ASL1: [Women's Solutions: Lessons for Conservation and Development in the Amazon region, October 2022](#). Gender related indicators are included in the results framework. And by gender the team will not only disaggregate by men and women (as asked by GEF) but other gender identities.

l) In component 3, the project will support the formulation and implementation of policies and regulations that involve territorial and sectoral matters and enhance conservation and sustainable development. This will in turn support planning and governance processes. The project will expect to promote, as the current GEF project does, memorandums of understanding with municipalities to incorporate environmental criteria in municipal territorial planning enhancing policy coherence. This of course depends on the political willingness of the governors ruling at the moment, but the project will build capacity on policy and project formulation, technical guides to inform land use planning, strengthening governance, among other efforts. Controlling potential perverse incentives that for instance could intensify cattle ranching in the Amazon in areas that are not legally allowed, are beyond project's control. There are no regulations that currently contradict the environmental and sustainable development efforts posed by the project.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**
- d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 2, 2024:

a)

a.1. The institutional arrangement is well described. In addition, please provide an organigram including funds flow and all stakeholders involved.

a.2. This section states that the project will be executed by Minambiente, however in the project information section only ?Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development? is listed. Please amend or have a mention that is the same entity.

a.3. ?Life and Biodiversity Fund? is being listed as the executing entity for all the items in the budget table. Please revise the CEO endorsement entry to ensure consistency throughout.

a.4. Please harmonize the font and size of the CEO Endorsement request Portal view.

Fiduciary. Fiducoldex will be responsible for managing grant funds acting as fiduciary agent for the FVyB, under the provisions of the fiduciary agreement in force entered between Minambiente (acting as FVyB's Trustee) and Fiducoldex. GEF funds will be received as advances to a designated account to be set at Fiducoldex. The PIU will prepare annual budget and operational plans for the Project which will be reviewed and approved by the project's executive committee. Fiducoldex will keep accounting records and issue periodic financial reports and statements. Financial reporting arrangements will ensure that total Project investment is incorporated in the Project financial reports and audited financial statements. An independent audit firm acceptable to the World Bank will conduct the project audits, under acceptable audit terms of reference. Procurement under the Project will adhere to the World Bank's Procurement Regulations for IPF Borrowers (fifth edition, dated September 2023), with Minambiente serving as the executing agency responsible for the procurement activities and Fiducoldex as the management of the project's procurement, contracting, and payment processes.

[1] Terms of reference for key members of the PIU has been included in the GEF package. This will be refined, submitted and approved by the World Bank as per procurement policies and guidelines.

Will the GEF Agency play an execution role on this child project?

If so, please describe that role here and the justification.

Also, please add a short explanation to describe cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects, including potential for co-location and/or sharing of expertise/staffing (max. 500 words, approximately 1 page)

Addressing the challenges facing the Colombian Amazon requires a collective effort involving a wide range of stakeholders and other initiatives and projects. Project design has taken, and future implementation will take into consideration complementarities with other programs led by World Bank and its partners, avoiding overlaps and establishing synergies. This will be the case, particularly for those partners supporting interventions in other NDFyB that have been prioritized by the government. Other institutions with public and international cooperation funding are supporting the implementation of the government's deforestation control plan in other active deforestation hotspots following the mandated approach, and so it's expected that Minambiente will promote exchange and cooperation between executing and implementing agencies as

b) N/A

c) and d) Yes, cleared.

October 24, 2024:

a) Thank you for all the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

a.1. an organigram with the strategic and operational flows has been included at the end of the Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project section.

a.2. /a.3. The executing entity will be the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (Miambiente in short in Spanish) through the Life and Biodiversity Fund. The team has added clarification throughout the project documents.

a.4. Noted. Done in the portal

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 25, 2024:

a)

a.1. For the core indicator 1.2, some WPAD and METT scores are missing. Please include the missing WDPA IDs and METT scores under core indicator 1.2.

a.2. The sub-indicator 4.5 (OMECs) is contextual and needs to be also reported in another sub-indicator under the core indicator 4 to be actually accounted in the GEF Portal (there is no double counting). Please add the total OMECs area under the core indicators 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 or 4.4 where it is most relevant.

a.3. The expected result for the core indicator 6.2 is not the same in the Ex-ACT tool (22.4 Mt CO₂e) and in the core indicator table in the Portal (17 Mt CO₂e). Please correct.

a.4. The project includes significant restoration activities, nevertheless they are not considered for the calculation of the GHG emission mitigation. Please include these activities too.

a.5. According to the Ex-ACT tool, the project will avoid the deforestation of 30,408 ha. Please clarify under the core indicator table how these number has calculated.

a.6. Under the copre indicator table, we learn that "8,000 hectares of forest restored in the active deforestation hotspots". Nevertheless, in the core indicator table only 2,523 ha are reported (the rest being agriculture, grass, woodland or wetland). Please clarify and be consistent.

October 24, 2024:

a) Thank you for all the amendments and clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

a.1. The team has included WDPA ID for two PAs (Miraflores Picachos Regional PA and Caqueta Land and Water Conservation District) that were missing. For others, these have not been yet registered of the areas not formally declared.

As indicated in the core indicators description, 4 areas have not tracked effectiveness using the METT yet. Part of the project will be to track baseline values before the end of the first year. Including these areas is a good accomplishment as it reflects interest by area managers to track their management using a common tool (even for Ramsar sites where its not an obligation under Colombian regulations). This will require activities to train the area managers. - Table with target METT scores uploaded in the roadmap.

a.2. the areas of OECMs in core sub indicator 4.5. have been incorporated into the 4.1. sub-indicator (Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity) too. Core indicators have been updated accordingly.

a.3. the correct amount 22.4 Mt CO₂ has been included in all relevant sections

a.4. the Calculations done for the core indicator using the ExAct tool (7th version), covers all the areas of intervention for components 1-3. The value of emissions mitigated include the 8,000 hectares restored. For that particular area, the estimation is a reduction of 1,308.677 Ton CO₂ eq.

a.5. The Colombian Forest and Carbon Monitoring system will be the main source of information. The 22.4 million tons of CO₂e of GHG mitigated were calculated using the EX-ACT tool (Version 7 ? multilanguage edition), considering the following parameters: area of interest of 9.87 million natural forest under some form of protection (National and regional parks and reserves, indigenous territories, Ramsar sites, and other areas for conservation), and 8,000 hectares of forest restored in the active deforestation hotspots. Reference period: 2012-2022, average annual deforestation: -0.204%, reporting period: 5 years of project implementation plus additional 15 years). The reference period provides the indication of deforestation in a scenario without project, -0.204%: 30,408 hectares. These are then estimated as the hectares of deforestation avoided in a scenario with project. This reference period is the same one as the one included in the most recent report submitted by Colombia to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

a.6. The total amount of expected 8,000 hectares restored include all the different ecosystems as indicated by GEF as sub-indicators: degraded agricultural lands, forest and forest land, natural grass and woodlands, wetlands. This is the total amount included in the core indicator table.

5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 2, 2024:

a) and b). Yes, cleared.

c)

c.1. Please describe how the Overall risk rating was identified.

c.2. Please adjust the rating under the "Environmental and Social" risk category in line with the ESS risk category. The ratings are not in line as is. Doing so would be in line with the description of the "Environmental and Social" risk category in Annex B of the GEF Risk Appetite document (GEF/C.66/13) stating that: "The rating reported by project under this category is identical to the Overall Safeguards Risk rating provided at PIF, CEO Endorsement, MTR and TE stage."

October 24, 2024:

c) Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

c. 1 and C.2. The overall Safeguard risk rating is analyzed separately by environmental and social risks. This information is included in the Risks to Achieving Outcomes table.

The project's environmental risk is rated Moderate. Significant benefits to forest conservation in high biodiversity areas are expected from project activities under Components 1 and 2, through the strengthening of Protected Areas (PAs), forest conservation and restoration agreements, and sustainable use of natural resources, contributing towards ecological connectivity and sustainable landscape management of ecologically important areas. Under Component 3, the project will support the incorporation of environmental criteria and key information in land use planning under key economic sectors to reduce drivers of deforestation.

Nevertheless, potential temporary, localized and reversible risks and impacts may arise from investments in bioeconomy value chains (timber from community forestry, non-timber and aquatic goods and services), community tourism, pest management in agroforestry and reforestation activities, eventual construction of small structures in remote areas for PA vigilance and control or facilities for product transformation.

Most of these impacts are expected to be prevented or minimized through the adoption of best practices and preventive and mitigation measures. As the project will also support technical

assistance on forestry, agroforestry and bioeconomy, the TORs for the technical assistance activities shall incorporate the relevant requirement to ensure adequate guidance will be provided to beneficiaries.

The project social risk is rated Substantial. The project intends to generate significant positive results for the population's livelihood and well-being and is expected to generate social benefits in areas critical for the survival of local communities, including IPs, Afro-Colombians, women and farmers, and capacities to manage their sustainable value chains, strengthen governance, food security, protection of cultural heritage, and recovery of cultural traditions. It aims to promote good practices for biodiversity conservation and ecosystem resilience, which is expected to produce positive outcomes for the next generations. The Project uses a highly participatory approach that emphasizes community consensus and participation to create conditions for the ownership by the stakeholders involved. The activities financed do not involve major infrastructure with adverse impacts on physical, cultural, and/or archaeological sites. No land acquisition or involuntary displacement is expected. Social risks and impacts identified at this stage are: a) contextual risks related to safety and security for IPs, afrocolombians and local communities or project workers, which may potentially exacerbate other project E&S risks given possible restrictions on entry into the territory; b) potential restrictions of access to natural resources used by communities because of new conservation practices promoted by the project or potential decrease in farmer's economic incomes during the transition to new sustainable value chains. Adequate mitigation measures to address them in line with the ESF will be identified.

As per WB procedures, risks ratings are adjusted as project preparation progresses. A risk rating for the whole project that includes environmental and social and other categories, is also included.

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
September 25, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response Thank you.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
September 25, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response Thank you.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
September 25, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response Thank you.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
September 25, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response Thank you.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
September 25, 2024:

We don't find the Gender Action Plan. Please upload it.

October 24, 2024:

Thank you for uploading the Gender Action Plan (file ?GEF8 - Vida Amazonia?). Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

The GAP was uploaded in the portal with the original submission - Document titled: "[GEF8 - Vida Amazonia](#)". Please however note that the document is in Spanish as it was prepared by the country

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 25, 2024:

We don't find the stakeholder engagement plan. Please upload it.

October 24, 2024:

Thank you for uploading the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (file ?GEF8 - Vida Amazonia- PPPI?). Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

The SEP was uploaded in the portal with the original submission - Document titled: "[GEF8 - Vida Amazonia- PPPI](#)". Please however note that the document is in Spanish as it was prepared by the country

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 2, 2024:

We note that the project's overall ESS risk is classified as high/substantial, and WB attached the Appraisal Environmental and Social Review Summary (ESRS) Appraisal Stage. The ?draft? ESMF will be developed based on the existing ESMF developed for the Heart of the Colombian Amazon project (P144271), ensuring alignment with the ESF. However, the overall environmental and social risk of the Environmental and Social Safeguards section (D. Policy Requirement) in the Portal said moderate risk. Please make this risk consistent with ESRS Appraisal Stage."

October 24, 2024:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

ESS rating updated in the portal.

As indicated in the table and explanation above, Environmental, and social risks are in fact substantial. The overall risk including all other categories is moderate. Thanks for noting that there was a mistake and in D. Policy requirement showed Moderate for E&S risk. It has been adjusted to substantial.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
September 24, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency ResponseThank you.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
September 24, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency ResponseThank you.

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
N/A

Agency Response
8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
October 2, 2024:

1. According to the financial tables (Annex A), the total amount for the PPG is \$199,998 and in Annex D, the total budgeted amount is \$345,500 and none of this amount has been spent or committed. Please clarify the situation in Annex D. Also please financially close the PPG in due time with Trustee and return any unused funds.
2. Please explain why none of the PPG money has been spent to date and what is the plan for using PPG now that the project has been submitted for CEO endorsement.
3. Please provide details on the activities implemented through the PPG rather than list expenditure categories.
4. ?Operating costs? is not a valid category. Please further clarify what this activity entails, so one can assess whether it is eligible.

ANNEX D: STATUS OF UTILIZATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG) ^o

Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GET/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
Consultant services	112,105.00	0.00	0.00
Training and Workshops	49,908.00	0.00	0.00
Operating Costs	183,487.00	0.00	0.00
Total	345,500.00	0.00	0.00

October 24, 2024:

Thank you for the amendments and clarification. We note that the total budgeted amount for the PPG is \$183,487 and not \$199,998 as the Agency response says. Please financially close the PPG in due time with Trustee and return any unused funds. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

1. There is a mistake in the table. The total amount for ppg is \$199,998, and the amount for activities (minus fees) is \$183,487. This has been fixed
2. Delays in setting up the institutional arrangements with the project, delayed setting up the grant recipient for the PPG. In the meantime, the government entities, with co-financing, committed to the project preparation. The plan for the PPG is to promptly hire a set of consultants (to happen before endorsement) for procurement and safeguard documents that are needed to comply with further stages of project preparation and negotiations. In addition, consultations with local communities will be funded by the PPG. This will be in line with the guidance that indicates that "Any PPG funding not fully used at CEO Endorsement/Approval should be indicated. The Agency can continue to use the remaining funds on the eligible expenditure items under PPG as presented in Table 1 within one year after the project has been CEO Endorsed/Approved."
3. and 4. The table has been adjusted to indicate activities instead of procurement categories.

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 24, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 2, 2024:

Please replace the name of co-financier for FAO to ?donor agency?.

October 24, 2024:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

Updated in the portal as requested.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs were provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 24, 2024:

Yes, the endorsement letter was uploaded at PFD. Cleared.

Agency Response Thank you.

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
September 24, 2024:

Yes, the endorsement letter was uploaded at PFD. Cleared.

Agency Response Thank you.

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

e) [If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
September 25, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response Thank you.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? (Note: the provision of maps is at the discretion of agencies considering sensitivities in the given context)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
September 24, 2024:

The map copied in the Portal is difficult to read due to low definition. Please try to copy a map with a better definition so that it can be read in the Portal.

October 24, 2024:

Thank you for this improved map. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

Map has been updated and copied in high resolution

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 25, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response Thank you.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 2, 2024:

1. ?Life and Biodiversity Fund? is being listed as the executing entity for all the items in the budget table, however it is not listed in the project information section. Please either update the budget table or to include this information in the project information section.

2. ?Minor works? is not a valid description of activities to be implemented. Please add more details or remove this items from the budget.

Works	Minor works	\$ 43,835	\$ 555,002			\$ 598,837			\$ 598,837	Life and Biodiversity Fund
--------------	-------------	-----------	------------	--	--	------------	--	--	------------	----------------------------

3. ?Office equipment? must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Pleas amend accordingly.

Goods	Field equipment (camera traps, binoculars), office equipment (including computers, printers) for partner executing institutions	\$ 702,517	\$ 92,500	\$ 416,252		\$ 1,211,269		\$ 1,211,269	Life and Biodiversity Fund
--------------	---	------------	-----------	------------	--	--------------	--	--------------	----------------------------

4. ?Other operating costs? are unusually high. Please consider adjusting these down. Office supplies, Operational costs (office, administrative expenses) are costs that must be covered by the GEF portion, and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Please adjust the budget accordingly.

Other Operating Costs	Operational costs (office, administrative expenses)	\$ 761,676				\$ 761,676		\$ 404,689	\$ 1,166,365	Life and Biodiversity Fund
	Communication materials (posters, publications, banners, website)		\$ 92,500	\$ 185,001	\$ 625,647	\$ 903,148			\$ 903,148	Life and Biodiversity Fund

5. Please include in different items/rows the costs associated with the M&E component.

Contractual Services – Individual	Technicians providing extension services, technical focal points, technical specialists	\$ 2,063,644	\$ 1,757,507	\$ 1,387,505	\$ 632,457	\$ 5,841,113	\$ 293,375.00		\$ 6,134,488	Life and Biodiversity Fund
Contractual Services – Company	Feasibility studies, auditing, project evaluation	\$ 198,459				\$ 198,459	\$ 119,831.00		\$ 318,290	Life and Biodiversity Fund

October 24, 2024:

Thank you for all the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thank you.

1. We have clarified that the execution will be done by the Ministry via the Life and Biodiversity Fund.

2. More details have been provided. Works will include small transformation plants for non-timber forest products, small community monitoring and rangers stations and infrastructure of indigenous communities will be adapted for tourism. The term 'minor' is strategically written to distinguish for WB procurement, environmental and social specialists the magnitude of the works and thus the level of risks these may entail.

3. This has been clarified. The equipment as part of the category of goods and part of the technical investment components are not related to the management of the project, but equipment needed by researchers, rangers, community biodiversity monitors to deliver technical activities within the components. (for example to process the data that is collected by the camera traps).

4. The Budget has been adjusted. The expenses that were marked as operational costs and supplies for components referred more to expenses related to technical workshops and training which now has been appropriately allocated. This review allowed for better adjustments from the government counterparts.

5. The costs associated to M&E have been distributed in different rows/items.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

ANNEX I: Responses to Project Reviews

8.11 a) Have responses to Council comments, if any, at PIF/PCN stage been provided?

b) Have responses to STAP screen, if any, been provided?

c) Have responses to other comments, if any, been provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 25, 2024:

Yes, relevant comments provided by Council and STAP have been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response Thank you.

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval /endorsement

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

October 2, 2024:

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above. In addressing the comments, please clearly indicate in the review sheet where the amendments/additions have been made and highlight them in yellow to facilitate the review.

October 24, 2024:

Thank you for addressing the comments. The CEO Endorsement is recommended.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	10/2/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/24/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		