

UAVs/drones for Equitable Climate Change Adaptation: Participatory Risk Management through Landslide and Debris Flow Monitoring in Mocoa, Colombia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10438

Countries

Colombia

Project Name

UAVs/drones for Equitable Climate Change Adaptation: Participatory Risk Management through Landslide and Debris Flow Monitoring in Mocoa, Colombia

Agencies

CAF

Date received by PM

11/11/2019

Review completed by PM

6/23/2020

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I – Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - Yes. The project is well aligned with GEF CCA-1: Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation

Agency Response no response is needed.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - Yes. The project design is clearly structured through three components that will deliver against the project outcomes and outputs.

Within component 3, please consider opportunities and strategies to incorporate the information produced, and approaches piloted, in Colombia's ongoing national climate information generation and adaptation planning processes. In doing so, please explain the feasibility of similar (though perhaps smaller) events or meetings to those that will be held in Mocoa and MIT to also be held in Bogota with relevant national actors, or sub-national actors in other regions. As may already be considered but would benefit from further explanation in the PIF, please briefly outline how meetings/event(s) with the relevant private and public sector actors in Bogota to compliment the event in Mocoa can also be useful to gain traction with private sector decision makers, including commercial banks and MFIs who operate in the area.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2020 - The information is noted and this is cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21st March 2020)

Two workshops will be held at CAF's office in Bogotá with private sector decision makers and national institutions involved in adaptation planning: (1) a workshop with micro-finance institutions such as BANCAMIA, and CREZCAMOS who are willing to collaborate, CONTACTAR (that requested a formal proposal to further involve in the project), Banco Agrario who has an agreement with Corpoamazonía for land restoration, and the Putumayo Chamber of commerce. This workshop will allow to co-design and solicit feedback for the data products and data service business model that will facilitate the integration of localized risk information into microfinance investment analysis for small-scale agro-forestry producers and eco-tourism entrepreneurs; (2) a workshop with representatives from national entities including IDEAM, IAvH, UNGRD, Fondo Acción, Invias, ANI, Minvivienda, and the focal point of the Green Climate Fund at DNP, among others, focused on the development of local adaptation indicators and data integration capacity with on-going data collection and adaptation planning processes, including the Integrated Adaptation Information System part of the Readiness Action Plan supported by the Green Climate Fund. The workshops in Mocoa will also include public service institutions such as the aqueduct companies, and energy. This information has also been added in the stakeholders' section of the CEO Endorsement Request.

1.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/13/2019 - Yes. The co-financing from CAF which is labeled as investment mobilized will go toward the establishment of a new credit line.

Clarifications requested - please see Item 2 in Part II

GEFSEC, 6/23/2020 - This is cleared.

Agency Response

N/A

5. GEF resource availability. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 14Nov2019:

We note that the GEF funds requested in this PIF plus the PPG requested totals almost \$549,905. Please note the amount initially indicated as potentially available for this project is \$500,000. A limiting factor is the total budget for this Challenge Program has a firm limit for the set of projects that will be supported, which we are not

able to go above. We will make efforts to consider the feasibility of this budget increase for this project and will provide further response shortly, but are unable to commit to the budget increase requested at this time.

Agency Response

N/A

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 11/13/2019 - Yes. This project will access financing from the Challenge Program modality of the SCCF-A.

Agency Response

N/A

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/13/2019 - No. Please submit the LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators and Metadata worksheet.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2020 - It does not appear that the Metadata and Core Indicators spreadsheet has been uploaded onto the portal. Please provide.

GEFSEC, 6/4/2020 - This is partially cleared. Thank you for including the LDCF/SCCF indicators framework. Noting the importance of supporting national and local capacity in capturing and communicating climate information using the new technologies deployed through this project, as well as orientation of government and financial institution officials in the ongoing use of the information generated, please resubmit this document including figures for number of people trained through this project, with the gender disaggregated.

GEFSEC, 6/9/2020 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21st March 2020):

LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators have been added in Part IF and Part II Section 6 of the CEO Endorsement Request. The Metadata Information will be uploaded to the GEF Portal by CAF

Agency Response (25th May 2020):

Excel file with Metadata and Core Indicators has been prepared and will be uploaded to the portal by CAF.

Agency Response (5th Jun 2020):

The Core Indicators in the CCA Framework (Excel File) have been updated to reflect persons trained, and is consistent with number of persons trained as detailed in the Gender Action Plan in Annex H of this CEO ER.

9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/13/2019 - Yes.

Agency Response

N/A

Part II – Project Justification

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - Yes. The adaptation problem, along with the root causes and barriers are well described in this submission.

Agency Response

N/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/13/2019 - Clarification requested. Expectations for this section typically include a brief snapshot of the BAU scenario, which could include relevant ongoing investments in the target areas. In addition, please make a distinction between these investments and the baseline investments, which are the set of ongoing and planned activities underway without GEF financing and are therefore funded by, or proposed to be funded by non-GEF funding and which are providing co-financing to the proposed initiative.

Please consider baseline relevance of Colombia's National Adaptation Plan and ongoing adaptation planning process, including the adaptation planning activities supported by the Green Climate Fund and its efforts to produce new locally relevant climate information and efforts to integrate this information into municipal government and private sector decision making (please see here: https://www.greenclimate.fund/documents/20182/466992/Readiness_proposals_-_Colombia__Fondo_Acci_n__Adaptation_Planning.pdf/2c0940c3-0bd5-4a13-ad53-392367c3f7c0)

GEFSEC, 4/22/2020 - Clarification requested. None of the 11 baseline initiatives are providing co-financing to this project? Please also provide more details on each of the initiatives providing co-financing to this initiative, either in the same section or under the table provided for the incremental (addition) cost.

In addition, this is an adaptation project - incremental costs are for GEF Trust Fund initiatives, whereas "additional" cost is for adaptation project being financed by the LDCF and/or the SCCF. In this case, the information on the BAU is appreciated, but the determination here would be of the additionality of the SCCF funding to what is already being funded by the baseline. co-financing in the context of LDCF/SCCF-funded adaptation projects is defined as the cost which would be incurred for BAU. This amount is considered the project's baseline and constitutes the co-financing; beyond that, the full cost of adaptation is the so-called additional cost and is paid out of the LDCF/SCCF. The rationale behind this concept of co-financing is to use the LDCF/SCCF funds to catalyze adaptation to climate change in the context of a larger development initiative.

Please refer to this document: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/Clarification_on_Additional_Cost_8_May_4.pdf

GEFSEC, 6/4/2020 - This is still not reflected on the portal - please update so that the changes made in the CEO ER are also in the portal. Please confirm if the changes to co-financing have also been updated in the portal - this is not apparent or immediately clear. - If changes are made to the CEO ER instead of on the portal directly, please ensure that the new text is consistent in the portal.

GEFSEC, 6/9/2020 - Additional information requested. This is related to co-financing but also to the baseline section/project description. For each of the 5 initiatives listed in Table C as providing co-financing, it would be appreciated if some further detail could be provided. As far as I can see, the only details provided on the co-financing investments are below:

"For purposes of co-financing consideration, the relevant activities under the above three (3) ongoing projects that provide a direct and complementary baseline for this proposed project have been identified, and the corresponding undisbursed portions of the available budget have been estimated and included as co-financing under the contribution from Corpoamazonia. Of note is the Putumayo Department Adaptation Plan currently being developed and will have a budget of US\$177,000. This

initiative is included under the GEF-funded Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program, and as such, is not being considered as a co-financing source for this proposed project."

and

"The project has been able to attract a total co-financing of \$2,665,201 USD. Of this amount \$1.8 million is being made available by CAF as a Credit Line via second tier banks for purposes of upscaling in the use of the technology to be developed and tested under the project. The Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, Corpoamazonia, MIT ESI and AirWorks Inc are collectively providing \$865,201 in related project investments, and in-kind technical and administrative support."

The Secretariat would appreciate some brief text for EACH initiative providing co-financing so as to assess the additionality of the LDCF investment. For example, "*The project XXX is providing XXX amount in co-financing. The project objective is X, with XX activities.*" That way the additionality rationale is clearer. The way it is currently written makes it difficult to determine additionality, while also offering an incomplete view of the co-financing initiatives.

GEFSEC, 6/22/2020 - Cleared.

Agency Response

• Agency Response (21st March 2020):

•

This section has been adjusted in the CEO Endorsement Request to differentiate between BAU Scenario, from the perspective 'relevant ongoing investments' and Baseline Investments from the perspective on 'non-GEF funded' investments.

•

Details on ongoing activities linked to Colombia's National Adaptation Plan and the GCF may be appreciated in Section 7 – Consistency with National Priorities

• Agency Response (25th May 2020):

• A reassessment by CAF, the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, MIT and Corpoamazonia of the investments listed under the BAU Scenario (ongoing) and Baseline (non-GEF funded) has resulted in an adjustment of both of these sections in this CEO Endorsement Request, with direct implications on the co-financing arrangements of the project. Concluded projects with no further funds to disburse or activities to be implemented have been removed from the BAU and placed under the Baseline (non-GEF funded) section and their relevance to the proposed project stated.

• Current/ongoing projects in the project intervention area, with continued implementation during the implementation cycle of this proposed project, with relevant complementary activities (though not climate change specific) to be executed, have been identified and listed under the BAU. Undisbursed funds of relevant complementary activities are now included in the project's co-financing in Section C of this CEO Endorsement Request as contribution from Corpoamazonia. Further details on co-financing have been provided in Section C.

- The text in Table 2 in Part II (5) of this CEO Endorsement Request has been totally rewritten to better represent the ‘additionality’ of the SCCF funding and differentiate from the BAU investment.

-

- Agency Response (5th Jun 2020):

- The information has been updated on the portal to ensure consistency with the CEO ER.

-

- Agency Response (18th June 2020):

- The project’s co-financing details have been updated in Part II, Section 5 of the CEO Endorsement Request: ‘Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCE, SCCF, and co-financing’. Specific details have been provided on exactly what activities are being funded under the BAU, in addition to a new table which outlines specific contributions/activities from each of the 5 co-financing sources.

- Additional Note:*** ‘Upon further analysis, it was determined that the project ‘Environmental Management Plan “Nucleos de Reconciliacion con la Naturaleza” would have executed all of its activities in Mocoa before the start of this proposed GEF project, and as such, has been moved from the BAU and transferred to the ‘Baseline’ section as a project with complementary results’

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - Yes. The project design is coherently described in sufficient detail.

Agency Response

N/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - Yes. This project is aligned with GEF CCA-1: Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation.

Agency Response

N/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - More clarification requested. Since this project will potentially be financed by the SCCF for adaptation activities, the reasoning should be related to the additional cost, rather than the incremental cost.

Recommended action: Please revise this section to describe the additional cost reasoning of the proposed adaptation benefits generated by the proposed activities in relation to the activities being financed by the baseline, as opposed to the "incremental cost", as it's presently written. A slightly greater emphasis on the adaptation element (relating to the vulnerable people, communities and natural/physical assets this project would be benefiting) would also be appreciated.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2020 - Not cleared. This section seems to still be labeled as "incremental cost." Please also see review item 2.

GEFSEC, 6/4/2020 - Please again refer to item 2. It seems as if the CEO ER has been updated, but not reflected on the portal.

GEFSEC, 6/9/2020 - There are still some issues regarding the additionality rationale, which are also raised in Item 2. The general additionality rationale of the SCCF contribution as a whole is clear, but it's less clear exactly what the co-financing initiatives are supporting and how the SCCF is going beyond that for each specific co-financing being provided.

GEFSEC, 6/22/2020 - This is cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21st March 2020):

The text in this section of the CEO Endorsement Request has been adjusted to better reflect the *SCCF Funds/additional costs* as opposed to Incremental Costs.

Agency Response (25th May 2020):

Relevant section relabeled as 'Additional Cost'. The text in Table 2 in Part II (5) of this CEO Endorsement Request has been totally rewritten to better represent the 'additionality' of the SCCF funding and differentiate from the BAU (regular development) investments.

Agency Response (5th Jun 2020):

The information has been updated on the portal to ensure consistency with the CEO ER.

Agency Response (18th June 2020):

Details on exactly what the co-financing will be supporting have been included in Part II, Section 5 of the CEO Endorsement Request: 'Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCE, SCCF, and co-financing'. Specific details have been provided on exactly what activities are being funded under the BAU, in addition to a new table which outlines specific contributions/activities from each of the 5 co-financing sources.

6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - More clarity requested. The adaptation benefit is clear from a planning perspective, but more details on the people and communities that the initiative will benefit would be appreciated.

Recommended action: Please provide more quantifiable information clearly linking project activities to reduced vulnerability and increased resilience of the people, their livelihoods, and the communities in Mocoa to the impacts of increased climate variability. For example (and this ties into the socio-economic benefits as well), how much do damages from landslides cost the municipality? How many people die from them? How much less vulnerable will people and communities be to these and/or other climatic events in terms of cost savings (to their livelihoods, etc.)

GEFSEC, 4/22/2020 - More information requested. More of this information should be provided in the "adaptation benefits" section on the portal. This section would be strengthened with more explicit consideration of the number of hectares in the Mocoa area that will directly gain increased climate resilient management to specified climate hazards and impacts through the project; as well as broader indirect benefits to the resilience of people and hectares elsewhere in Colombia beyond Mocoa through national scale knowledge sharing on technologies and methodologies piloted through this project. In this sense, it will be important to highlight these figures, as well as figures of number of people training both in Mocoa and nationally and internationally, in the SCCF/LDCF indicators framework document.

GEFSEC, 6/3/2020 - The additional information provided is appreciated, however, please refer to the item on Core indicators.

GEFSEC, 6/9/2020 - This is cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21st March 2020):

The project approach will strengthen local capacities to engage diverse actors in developing the necessary social and technological infrastructure for community-based, inter-agency landslide monitoring and risk reduction strategies. A main social benefit to be produced by the project is the reduction of vulnerability and increased resilience of 20,300 persons to the impacts of climate change in a rural mountainous community in Colombia that has suffered tremendous devastation from a climate-related natural disaster. Through the building of local technical capacity and engagement by the project, the local community and authorities will be empowered to lead and manage their own Early Warning System (EWS) for excessive rainfall and mudslides, thus better preparing the community to adapt to the impacts of climate change and save lives.

The EWS will also allow the community of Mocoa to rebuild lives, crops and infrastructure destroyed in the 2017 disaster, without the fear of being surprised by another major catastrophe. Additionally, a key social benefit is the fact that 10,000 women in Mocoa will benefit from reduced vulnerability and increased resilience to the impacts of climate change.

Finally, an assessment of key factors disrupting the terrain will allow to extrapolate results to an area of 3,122 ha of natural ecosystems that will be given the opportunity to rebound through a credit line aimed to fund actions to mitigate landslide risks affecting local small producers and their value chains through Ecosystem-based Adaptation (MEBA) strategies. These efforts will provide climate, landslide risk, land-use and crop information, to enable financial investments in climate resilience and Ecosystems-based Adaptation (EbA) practices by small-scale farmers and eco-tourism entrepreneurs in order to continue to provide environmental goods and services including water, surface soil erosion prevention, non-timber and medicinal forest products and carbon sequestration benefits.

The project will specifically contribute to global adaptation benefits by addressing the following Core Indicators:

Core Indicators for the LDCF and the SCCF corresponding to Objective 1

Core Indicator 1: Number of direct beneficiaries

Total: **20,300**

Males: 9,947

Females: 10,353

*Core Indicator 2: Area of land under climate-resilient management (ha): **3,122 ha***

Sub-Indicators for the LDCF and the SCCF corresponding to Output 1.1.3

No. of people reached by EWS, i.e., no. of direct beneficiaries

Total: **20,300**

Males: 9,947

Females: 10,353

No. of people receiving access to climate information

Total: **20,300**

Males: 9,947

Females: 10,353

Sub-Indicators for the LDCF and the SCCF corresponding to Output 1.1.4

Type of Natural system and Unit, Quantity (ha)

Tropical Humid Piedmont Zonobiome: **1,093 ha**

Sub-Andean Orobiome: **1,717 ha**

Andean and High-Andean Orobiome: **312 ha**

Agency Response (25th May 2020):

This has been expanded under Part II (6) of this CEO Endorsement Request. Additionally, adaptation benefits are much better represented in the text in Table 2 in Part II (5) of this CEO Endorsement Request which has been totally rewritten to better represent the ‘additionality’ of the SCCF funding and differentiate from the BAU (regular development) investments, and thus the adaptation benefits to be produced by the project.

Agency Response (5th Jun 2020):

The Core Indicators in the CCA Framework (Excel File) have been updated to reflect persons trained, and is consistent with number of persons trained as detailed in the Gender Action Plan in Annex H of this CEO ER.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - Yes. Most of UAVs application in climate change research has focused on either mapping of existing forests, analyzing climate impacts on agriculture practices, monitoring the ice cover of the arctic region, and air quality analysis. The proposed project leverages technological advances in these areas to implement a framework for innovative technology development of UAVs for community-based landslide monitoring. MIT's academic strengths developing curricula, certificate programs & research will provide a technical foundation to foster local talent.

Agency Response

N/A

8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - Yes.

Agency Response

CAF, November 27, 2019.

No further explanation needed.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/13/2019 - Yes. The project provides a detailed description of stakeholder engagement activities undertaken up to this point and a table outlining all pertinent stakeholders, their respective relationships to the project, and expected impacts on implementation.

Agency Response

N/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - More information requested. Will this project produce a gender action plan? Is there any additional information regarding gender gaps or opportunities linked to this project's activities? Please elaborate briefly.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2020 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21st March 2020):

A Gender Analysis is included in Section 3 of the CEO Endorsement Request and a Gender Mainstreaming Plan, inclusive of a Gender Action Plan is presented in Annex H. Gender-sensitive indicators are also presented in the Project Results Framework

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/13/2019 - Yes. Private sector engagement will occur across 5 key entrypoints: (1) Through the stakeholder engagement; (2) Through the Advisory Committee (see Figure 1); (3) Entrepreneurs in the local/regional technology sector will be mapped to identify potential local suppliers; (4) Local producers and property owners in high-risk areas will be engaged through the conference and results exhibition in Mocoa; and (5) Through the launch event and roundtable at MIT.

Agency Response

N/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - More information requested. Is there any risk that the drone equipment could get stolen or damaged?

GEFSEC, 4/22/2020 - This is cleared. Additional information requested:

On Environmental and Social Safeguards – while risks screening has taken place, but is there more information on Environmental and Social Risks Level rating? Please attach its screening report and or indicate more clearly, in line with the GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards.

GEFSEC, 6/4/2020 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21st March 2020):

This has been addressed in Table 2. Project Risks and Mitigation Measures in the CEO Endorsement Request.

Agency Response (25th May 2020):

The Environmental and Social Safeguards Screening Report, in accordance with CAF/GEF Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies has been completed and attached to this CEO Endorsement Request as Annex J.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/13/2019 - Yes. CAF will be the GEF implementing agency for the project, through the Directorate of Sustainability, Inclusion and Climate Change. The implementation of the project will be carried out as a partnership with MIT and Corpoamazonia, as executing agencies. MIT and Corpoamazonia will Co-Chair a Steering Committee (SC) with representatives from the main partners.

Further to comment 2 of section 2 above, please consider opportunity to coordination with and perhaps replicate the approach pilot by this project through Colombia's National Adaptation Plan and ongoing adaptation planning process including as supported from the Green Climate Fund, and the efforts within this process to produce new locally relevant climate information and efforts to integrate this into municipal government and private sector decision making (please see here: https://www.greenclimate.fund/documents/20182/466992/Readiness_proposals_-_Colombia___Fondo_Accion___Adaptation_Planning.pdf/2c0940c3-0bd5-4a13-ad53-392367c3f7c0)

GEFSEC, 6/9/2020 - This is cleared.

As the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for

execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. Technical clearance of this PIF will in no way endorse any alternative execution arrangement.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21st March 2020):

A representative of DNP will be recruited for the AC to facilitate the integration of Mocoa's localized risk data with the Readiness Program's Integrated Adaptation Information System, to explore opportunities to scale-up data collection methods through the National Adaptation Plan, and to further strengthen private sector engagement to encourage investment in adaptation efforts.

CAF will be performing the exclusive role of GEF Implementing Agency.

Agency Response (18th June 2020):

No response is required from the Agency.

15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/13/2019 - More information requested. The project is well aligned with Colombia's national climate change policies, but please indicate whether they are aligned with the needs communication in the NDC, as well as any sustainable development plans.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2020 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21st March 2020):

This section of the CEO Endorsement Request has been revised to better reflect alignment with Colombia's National Climate Change Policy and the National Climate Change Adaptation Plan, and the goals of the NDC.

16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - More information requested. There is a general description of the project's KM approach and a component dedicated to "knowledge sharing infrastructure"; however, the latter seems to refer to the sharing of drone acquired landslide data. Within the context of this review item, KM would refer to a systematic approach employed by the project to capture, manage, and disseminated project-level results and lessons.

Recommended action: Please provide slightly more detail regarding the KM plan for this project, so as to capture, manage, and share project results, lessons learned, and best practices.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2020 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21st March 2020):

The Knowledge Management section of the CEO Endorsement Request has been expanded to incorporate a systematic and institutionalized approach to Knowledge Management, consistent with global KM principles.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - No. The submission indicates that a costed M&E plan will be submitted at CEO Endorsement; however, this is a one-step MSP form so all required supporting material and information must be submitted at this time.

Recommended action: Please submit the budgeted M&E plan.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2020 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21st March 2020)

A description of the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and a breakdown of associated costs are presented in Section 9 of the CEO Endorsement Request

1.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - More information requested. The submission indicates that more than 35,000 people will benefit directly from this project. More elaboration on exactly how the data and information infrastructure created by this project will benefit the local people and communities would be appreciated. Please refer to Item 6.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2020 - This is cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21st March 2020):

The Benefits section (Section 10) has been restructured and expanded to better explain the anticipated adaptation benefits. Adaptation benefits are also presented in Section 6 of the CEO Endorsement Request.

19. Annexes:

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - No, Annex A is missing.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2020 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21st March 2020):

The Project Results Framework is presented in Annex A of the CEO Endorsement Request.

20. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS):

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 6/22/2020 - The Environmental and Social Safeguards Screening Report, in accordance with CAF/GEF Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies has been completed and attached to this CEO Endorsement Request as Annex J.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - Not provided. Please provide the results framework.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2020 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21st March 2020):

The Project Results Framework is presented in Annex A of the CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response N/A

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response N/A

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response N/A

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - Yes.

Agency Response

Agency Response (21st March 2020):

See in Annex E.

Part III – Country and Agency Endorsements

1. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - Yes. An LOE signed by the current OFP is included.

Agency Response N/A

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 CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

N/A

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - Not yet. Please refer to flagged items and resubmit. It seems as if the agency may have unintentionally utilized the 1-step MSP template, when in fact the intention was to submit this proposal as a 2-step MSP. Please confirm if this is the case and resubmit using the correct template if it's actually intended for consideration under the 2-step process for MSPs.

GEFSEC, 4/27/2020 - Not yet, please refer to flagged items and resubmit.

GEFSEC, 6/4/2020 - Not yet, please refer to flagged items and resubmit. Additionally, please ensure that all changes and additional information are available and reflected in the portal submission.

GEFSEC, 6/9/2020 - Some clarifications requested before proceeding, mainly relating to co-financing. Please address and resubmit for consideration.

GEFSEC, 6/23/2020 - All items have been adequately addressed for this stage of project development and this project is being recommended for technical clearance.

GEFSEC, 7/7/2020 - Some additional policy related items to be addressed:

1. The Focal Area outcomes description is incorrect as they included the Source of Funding – please amend.
2. Audits are included in the M&E Plan when it should be charged to the PMC. Kindly note that although it says “to be paid from CAF Agency fee” the total of 19K includes the 3K from the audit.
3. Below is an extract of CAF’s co-financing letter. There is no real confirmation that CAF will be accessing the loan of 1.8 Million USD. This amount cannot be considered as actual co-financing – hence, it has to be removed unless there is another letter that actually confirms the co-financing. If materialized later on, the Agency can report this through the Portal’s Implementation Modules.
4. The letter from Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development is in Spanish and I didn’t see any translation. The letter from MIT ESI indicates that their co-financing is in “cash” but it has been reported as “in kind”.
5. It is indicated that civil society and private sector participated in consultations for project development, but a description about those consultations is missing. A description of stakeholders to be involved and their role is however included. Please note that the Policy on Stakeholder Engagement requires that at PIF stage ‘Agencies provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development’.

GEFSEC, 7/21/2020 - Agency responses are in Annex B.

1) Cleared

2) Not cleared. This is not reflected in the portal, please amend.

3) This is cleared by GPU.

4) Action requested: This explanation is sufficient but if it is the case, please kindly change the co-financing label in Table C from in-kind to cash.

5) Cleared.

GEFSEC 31July2020:

All of the comments above have been addressed.

Regarding comment #2 above, the total amount has been changed in the relevant table of the CEO Endorsement request to \$16,000.

Regarding comments #4 above, the CEO Endorsement template does not provide an option for "cash", and based on explanation provided "inkind" is the most appropriate type of cofinancing given this will be provided in the form of time of staff and other inkind support.

Review Dates

1SMSP CEO Approval

Response to Secretariat comments

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

1SMSP CEO Approval

Response to Secretariat comments

Additional Review (as necessary)

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The CAF/MIT project, UAVs/drones for Equitable Climate Change Adaptation: Participatory Risk Management through Landslide and Debris Flow Monitoring in Mocoa, Colombia (GEF ID 10438), aims to advance equitable adaptation to climate change by reducing vulnerability through innovative technology development of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) for community-based landslide and debris flow monitoring and risk projection. The project will achieve its objective through the implementation of activities under three components: (i) Technological Infrastructure; (ii) Engagement and Local Capacity Building; and (iii) Knowledge Sharing Infrastructure and Data Applications. The project approach will strengthen local capacities to develop the necessary social and technological infrastructure for community-based, inter-agency landslide monitoring and risk reduction strategies. The project will increase the resilience of 20,300 persons to the impacts of climate change in a rural, mountainous community that has recently suffered tremendous devastation from a climate-related natural disaster. Through the building of local technical capacity and engagement by the project, the local community and authorities will be empowered to lead and manage their own Early Warning System (EWS) for excessive rainfall and mudslides, thus better preparing the community to adapt to the impacts of climate change. The proposed project leverages technological advances in these areas to implement a framework for innovative technology development of UAVs for community-based landslide monitoring leveraging MIT's hands-on education models and participatory approach to co-develop and transfer technological capacities to Corpoamazonia. Lessons and technological tools resulting from this pilot project will be documented and disseminated through the partner's multi-scale network to contribute to the global conversation on the use of UAV's for equitable climate adaptation by providing clear guidance on the hardware, algorithm and model to engage local communities in technology related business opportunities.