

# Integrated watershed management of the Putumayo-Içá river basin

**Review PIF and Make a recommendation**

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10531

**Countries**

Regional (Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru)

**Project Name**

Integrated watershed management of the Putumayo-Içá river basin

**Agencies**

World Bank

**Date received by PM**

3/22/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/15/2020

**Program Manager**

Christian Severin

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## PIF

### Part I – Project Information

#### Focal area elements

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

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): No,

1) This project is not consistent with the approach that the GEF is taking to address the ASGM sector. The GEF focuses on an upstream approach to mercury management in the ASGM sector, while GEF funds can help to develop plans for remediation of mercury contaminates sites we cannot use GEF resources for site

clean up. This project should focus on an upstream coordinated approach between the four countries to prevent illegal gold mining that uses mercury in the watershed.

- 2) This project should consider taking a landscape and jurisdictional approach for ASGM management in the Putumayo. The GOLD+ project will demonstrate a jurisdictional approach and this project would benefit from a similar approach.
- 3) Colombia, Peru and Ecuador all participate in the GEF GOLD Program, however there are no demonstrations specifically in the Putumayo Basin within those projects, therefore the activities of this project should very closely coordinate with the GOLD Program child projects, including policies and regulation and knowledge sharing and communications.
- 4) Mercury monitoring, which is included in component 3, is not currently being funded through the GEF. The Minamata Convention is still working on the approach for global mercury monitoring, thus this is ineligible for GEF funding until guidance is provided by the convention.
- 5) GEBs of 1 ton mercury is low considering the GEF funding requested.

1.

2. The proposal may be eligible for IW funding, if:

- 1) The concept has a much stronger alignment between the Amazon river Basin Strategic Action Programme Priorities and the suggested component activities. Furthermore, in the current submission, it is not possible to understand what the tangible deliverables will be from the component descriptions. The component descriptions are too generic and lack identifying outcomes and outputs.
- 2) Please note this is a SAP implementation project, hence stress reduction results are expected. The current component descriptions seems to indicate that focus is on knowledge management. Surely, KM is important, but as SAP implementation projects focus on delivering results on the ground, that will minimize the environmental stress on the ecosystem.
- 3) The project submission in general lack description on the relationship between the Amazon SAP and this proposed set of investments.
- 4) The proposal need to further elaborate on the transboundary fisheries. The proposed executing agency presented interesting data on this, during preparatory meetings and transboundary fisheries was identified as one of the priorities, but in the submitted version transboundary fisheries is only mentioned very briefly.

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Cleared from IW side. On CW please address following points:

1. Annex D in the GEF datasheet should reflect the CW comments submitted though the portal and the WB's response in the portal, not the preliminary comments emailed to the WB.

2. The text mentions that the project will deliver 3 tons of Mercury removed. However, the core indicator table only mentions 1 ton. Please make sure there is coherency between the numbers listed.

15th of April 2020 (cseverin): Cleared from CW side too

## **Agency Response**

041020

Done and included in the GEF datasheet submitted on April 10th.

Numbers on reported Mercury are adjusted

040320

Eligibility on C&W:

1. The project will not work directly with mining operations, formalize the ASGM sector or provide access to finance to afford mercury free equipment. Countries see this project as a unique opportunity to pilot a jurisdictional collaborative approach that responds to the specific context of the region and addresses the drivers and impacts of water contamination (including mercury) from upstream to downstream the basin.

Despite not following the GOLD GEF program, the project will contribute to “under C&W agenda: Program 1. Industrial Chemicals Program (Chemicals used/emitted from/in processes and products) – this sub-component of the C&W strategy addresses Reduction and elimination of mercury from the Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining Sector” as stands in the GEF Programming directions.

This collaborative jurisdictional approach will inform adaptation of laws and regulations, promote harmonization of procedures and protocols, and strengthen enforcement to reduce mercury contamination and its impacts on the environment and health. This approach and intervention will also inform the countries Minamata National Action Plans, to include considerations that respond to local context like the one of the Putumayo-Içá basin and the need for coordinated action between countries.

Before signature of the LoEs, the PCN was reviewed and agreed by the countries and this project component was highly prioritized to scale up accomplishments achieved and extend actions developed at regional scale.

2. The project benefits from having the CW focal area linked with an IW focal area so that the landscape regional approach is immersed in the expected basin management. As indicated in the PCN, the project will promote communication and exchange of knowledge with the existing GOLD projects in Colombia, Ecuador and Peru for those matters that are relevant for the particular context of the basin.

3. See the two comments before. As confirmed by the focal points from each of the countries, expected actions in the Putumayo do not align with GEF GOLD approach that calls for the formalization of the activity, providing access to finance for small gold miners, among others. That said, collaboration with the teams working in these projects will be promoted to ensure knowledge sharing and communication.

4. Thanks for clarification on this.

While guidance is provided, the project will support capacity building of the institutions in charge of implementing the Minamata Convention.

Ongoing research conducted for instance by the Government of Colombia (see link for a publication coming from this research in Spanish) will inform the process leading to improved enforcement. One of the goals intended for the project is to expand research to inform enforcement actions at regional scale.

The component description will be adjusted to remove what the GEFSEC clarified cannot be financed under Chemicals and Waste focal area.

5. The team together with the participant countries will address this comment, adjust the component approach and aim for a higher target in the order of 3 tons. As the emphasis will be geared towards enforcement and harmonization of policies, an increase of reduced mercury shall be expected. Ground truth will allow to provide an improved target.

Monitoring of the target at midterm and completion will require additional sources of financing considering that the GEF finds mercury monitoring non eligible.

Besides this subindicator, the project will remain committed to Core subindicator 9.4. Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste. The legislation is already in place in the four countries (Peru, Colombia, Ecuador, Brazil), but through regional agreements, the project aims to promote the implementation of such legislation in specific sites across the Putumayo basin.

#### Eligibility on IW

1. The latest version of the PCN provides more details and show how the project is aligned with the GEF-financed Regional Strategy for Integrated Water Resources Management in the Amazon Basin, particularly in regard to Strategic Actions: Reducing the vulnerability of bioaquatic ecosystems of the Amazon Basin; and Supporting the strengthening of institutional and management frameworks to improve water resources management. The project will collaborate with the GEF-financed Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) to ensure Integrated and Sustainable Management of the Transboundary Water Resources of the Amazon River Basin Considering Climate Variability and Change. The project will support some of the priority regional transboundary problems identified in the SAP that are relevant to this basin, and its associated actions including: water pollution by implementing a regional water quality monitoring system and protecting, managing and monitoring aquifers; deforestation by conserving and using water resources sustainably in the headwaters and lowlands; and the need to support legal and institutional frameworks to improve water resources management. The project information generated through scientific and also traditional knowledge will also

support the regional information platform that has been prioritized by the SAP. The specific strategic actions to be supported are presented in the table included in Annex 2 of the PCN. Further development of the project will allow to indicate contribution of this project to the specific activities included in the SAP.

2. KM is the focus of the project's component 1. This knowledge will support concrete implementation and actions in all the other project components. The project also aligns with SAP's knowledge management component and the information gathered for the Putumayo-Ica will feed into the regional platform.

In addition, the project aims to deliver results on the ground for this particular basin. The project will support joint actions to enhance water security in freshwater ecosystems through enhanced regional and national cooperation on shared freshwater surface and groundwater basins, thus aligning to the IW focal area. Among other activities, component 4 will support the development of the business case, processing techniques to add value to products and services and marketing strategies. Based on further characterization and analysis of specific sites, the project will suggest and promote alternative agrotechnology systems for terraced vegetable gardens and fisheries which is among the activities included in the SAP.

This cooperation builds on years of dialogue between public and private institutions and supported by multilateral agreements with presidential endorsements.

Preliminary key results are indicated in the PCN with initial indicators. The theory of change included in the annex indicates preliminary outputs at concept stage.

Following preparation stages, this will be further developed with key stakeholders. Among the results of the ground the project aims to pilot initiatives of sustainable managed, added value and commercialization of fisheries and other natural resources.

3. See comment above

4. Following the request, Annex 5 of the PCN includes further information

#### **Indicative project/program description summary**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): No table B is provided (GEF Data Sheet is to be submitted, according to the GEF/WB harmonization policies), so impossible to assess, however, it is clear that the proposal need to carefully assess the core indicators and identify what the project will deliver.

More comments will be provided on this, when it becomes more clear the alignment between suggested activities, the Amazon SAP Priorities (<https://iwlearn.net/resolveuid/a1df4c4c-49c4-4f7c-b4f4-29a31ee23a14>) and specific deliverables. The brief component descriptions do not provide enough information to understand what will be the tangible outcomes and outputs from the investment.

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes, however, as agency indicates in the responses below. It is important that the activities and output indicators are further refined during project preparation.

### **Agency Response**

041020

Thank you, noted.

040320

The GEF template for the concept stage GEF Data Sheet now includes outcomes and key outputs in Table B. In addition, the theory of change included in the annex indicates preliminary outputs at the concept stage. Furthermore, preliminary key results are indicated in the PCN with initial outcome indicators. The list of indicators is provided in Para 25 of the PCN. The team attempted to include as many relevant core GEF Indicators as possible.

Project activities will be further refined to ensure that the targets for all the applicable GEF core indicators will be achieved. These indicators will be monitored throughout the project.

During the next preparation stages, this will be further developed with key stakeholders. Detailed activities, aligned with those suggested by the SAP will be determined in the project appraisal document, budget and procurement strategy.

### **Co-financing**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): Partly, the WB documents uploaded, seems to be only reflecting on the GEF financing, hence it appears that this investment is 100% financed from GEF resources. However, the portal entry indicates a range of co-financing entries, where as most are public recurrent financing. Please investigate if the proposed financing can be aligned with upcoming IBRD financing or other financing that will be dedicated to implement the activities identified, to ensure a higher likeliness that identified financing will not disappear during project preparation period.

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

040320

The cofinancing presented is confirmed contribution from the country governments, showing commitment from different institutions. Although many investments have already been committed to the ASL national projects, two IBRD operations were identified from Colombia and Brazil.

Current ratio is over 1:8.

Further cofinancing will be discussed during next phases of project preparation. Potential cofinanciers are conducting program planning and new opportunities that would match the timeline of this project will be assessed. Letters of cofinancing will be secured during appraisal stage and for GEF CEO Endorsement request.

### **GEF Resource Availability**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin):partly, both focal areas require additional information is provided on what the investment will deliver. Further, for CW, considerable changes needs to be carried out in the documents.

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes for IW

15th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes for CW



**Agency Response**

040320

In addition to the explanation above, more specific information will be provided after further preparation and socialization stages with key stakeholders. Required changes will be made and reflected in the next project document. The PIF and the Decision notes are recording these changes, as discussed with the GEF Sec.

The STAR allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

The focal area allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

Project Preparation Grant

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): PPG has not been requested by the agency

**Agency Response**

Core indicators

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): No, please reassess the impacts estimated, as discussed on CW financing. Moreover, please re-estimate, if indeed the project will only be able to have 2000 people benefit from this investment, it seems VERY low. Furthermore, the submitted information does not provide details on delivery of results, it is not possible to assess if all core indicators correctly reflect on impact. eg, as the demonstration activities have not been described to a level where it is possible to understand what they will achieve.

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes, indeed helpful with the GEF datasheet

## **Agency Response**

040320

Impact under C&W financing is difficult to assess at this stage due to low capacity in the participating countries. The team will appreciate guidance from the GEFSEC as to how measure the impact

Additional information will be provided after further preparation and socialization stages with key stakeholders. This will allow us to better reflect on the GEF subindicators. Even more so, the results framework to be included in the project appraisal document will provide other outcome indicators besides GEF core ones.

On the number of beneficiaries: this is a watershed with low population density, mostly consisting of indigenous communities. That said, the number of beneficiaries will be revised during project preparation stage.

## **Project/Program taxonomy**

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

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): No, considering this project is proposed to take place in part of the Amazon Basin, it seems that the project should not tag ABNJ, please reconsider

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

040320

Taxonomy annex is adjusted, thank you for guidance

### **Part II – Project Justification**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): Partly, the alignment with the ministerial endorsed SAP and its priorities needs to be much strengthened. Furthermore, in order to respond to this question, it is also essential that the project description includes more clear outcome and output indicators, pertaining to the two focal areas.

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

040320

The project will be further detailed providing with activities which will be aligned to what has been broadly described in the SAP (and indicated in Annex 2 of the PCN). Concept level outcomes and outputs are included in the PCN and their indicators are to be developed in the next preparation stage to be reviewed for CEO Endorsement.

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020: Yes

### **Agency Response**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): No, Please add more detail on component outcomes in the GEF data sheet

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

040320

The PCN provides a concept stage description of the project's outcomes and components that complements the tables included in the GEF data sheet. Also, the Theory of Change provided in Annex 3 should provide a relevant level of details.

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): Partly, it will be easier to assess when descriptions have been elaborated upon. and above comments addressed.

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes for IW

15th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes for CW

### **Agency Response**

040320

Agree. The project description at the concept stage will be further elaborated in the future and the team will appreciate the GEFSEC guidance and support during the coming process.

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): No, the uploaded information, nor the uploaded documents, include incremental reasoning, please provide.

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

040320

The PCN document section on Economic analysis includes reference to GEF incremental cost reasoning. In addition to that see the explanation below. Full economic analysis, assessment of the GEF incremental cost and additionally will be provided in the Project Appraisal Document.

GEF funding will add incremental value to existing actions at the national level and bring it up to the basin landscape level scale. GEF funds will allow to alleviate environmental threats in a high biodiversity basin. Compared to other landscapes in the Amazon, coordinated actions upstream and downstream in the Putumayo-Ica will allow to contain further expansion of threats instead of acting to remediate severe deforestation, degradation and contamination hotspots. GEF funds will be instrumental to bring together institutions and communities from the four countries to jointly act to address issues of key concern such as illegal mining and its impact on the environment and communities' health. Currently, information and knowledge about the region are siloed and thus not available to support holistic decision making by all relevant stakeholders. Water resources planning and management occur mostly sector by sector at national levels. The initial workshops held by key stakeholders during project preparation have allowed to identify the incremental value that can be achieved with GEF funds. Activities and planning done at each country can be expanded, shared and scaled up at the regional level. In addition, integrated water resource management with specific on the ground interventions in prioritized sites will not only provide benefits in terms of food security but also conservation of existent levels of biodiversity. Without funding, public agencies will lack funding for effective extension services, law enforcement and the comprehensive, landscape-level planning frameworks to address existing systemic threats. The result will be productivity loss, biodiversity loss, and increased degradation and contamination. The GEF financing will build on existing diagnostics at broader Amazon scale, and incomplete ones at the basin scale, as well as baseline investments to mainstream biodiversity- and ecosystem-friendly fishing practices into the planning instruments and processes, and into extension services, providing tools and capacity to collectively better enforce regulations and policies and pilot remediation measures in priority sites.

Compared with forests and other terrestrial ecosystems, few efforts have been made to understand and conserve the water resources of the Putumayo-Iça basin, especially at the necessary large scales. To address drivers of degradation, and the nature of upstream to downstream cumulative impacts, which can originate in either uplands or wetlands, GEF funds will be instrumental to promote both national actions and collaboration across borders are critical to ensure long-term success. Joint integrated management approaches are also most cost-effective and environmentally, socially and financially sustainable than the exclusive implementation of individual actions by each country. Implementation of harmonized approaches will reduce duplication of efforts, thus maximizing the impact of resources invested. Finally, the multifocal nature of the project (CW and IW) will increase the impact of GEF resources that if financed through separate projects.

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): Hard to assess, as the documents, nor uploaded portal information is elaborating on deliverables. Please include, as indicated above.

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes, but there is a clear need to continue this development as the project advances its development. The project will benefit from more clear, quantifiable output indicators.

#### **Agency Response**

041020

thank you, noted. Detailed project results framework will be developed during project preparation stage.

040320

The estimated PIF level core indicators were included reflecting what the countries assessed as achievable. As project preparation is further developed, more information will allow to reflect with better precision on these indicators as well as other outcome level indicators.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): This has not been elaborated on in the documents submitted, but it is believed that the investment will be including activities that will be innovative and that this amazon sub basin investment will be important in relation for long term sustainability of the Amazon basin as a whole and for the Putumayo in particular.

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes, some has been identified, but will be elaborated on further during project preparation

**Agency Response**

041020

Thank you, noted.

040320

The team appreciates the GEFSEC comment.

While there have been several projects and initiatives for protected areas systems, mainstreaming of biodiversity and natural resource management, the project will include a suite of investments to be coordinated regionally across the four countries in this basin. Brazil and Ecuador will join innovative efforts of coordinated action, planning, and dialogue between Peru and Colombia towards a shared vision that also aligns with cultural tradition. Aiming to harmonize policies that impact the region and work across countries under a common landscape approach. Under this approach, the project will also align and partner with actions supported by the GEF Amazon Sustainable Landscapes program and its national projects in each of the countries.

Promoting knowledge sharing of innovative practices among countries and other partners will raise awareness, commitment and buy in to incorporate the approach. Other innovations will translate as follows:



Technological innovations: The project aims to apply watershed monitoring and planning decision support systems in partnership. In addition, it will develop and use online applications and smartphones for community-based monitoring (in partnership with WCS Citizen Science for the Amazon). The project will also analyze and pilot potential agrotechnology systems for vegetable gardens and fisheries (as suggested in the SAP).

Business model innovations: Promoting value chains in the Amazon with products coming from remote areas and limited distribution systems and finding niche markets that value sustainable products will require innovation and scaling up of lessons from other successful business models and entrepreneurship forms.

Institutional innovation: The Program will support innovative ways to foster changes in informal institutions and strengthen multistakeholder governance structures. Respecting stakeholder engagement approaches, it will also promote the recovery and exchange of traditions that for centuries have protected forests and rivers. Innovative changes in formal institutions will be mostly achieved through promoting coordination to jointly address issues of common concern, including illegal mining and others.

Policy innovation: The program will promote analysis of national policies around issues of common concern to foster dialogue among stakeholders, learning and harmonization of activities developed around such policies; mainstream environmental concerns into sectoral policies, to build sustainability into government interventions; strengthen new policies and frameworks that support integrated watershed management. Supporting implementation of the SAP, the project will generate information and recommendations to improve existing legal and institutional frameworks at the to help strengthen IWRM in the specific context of this basin

The project has been identified by all four governments as a pilot for regional integrated watershed management with the potential to generate lessons that can be scaled up in other Amazon basins; thus, the importance of component 1 that will allow for systematization of lessons learned and knowledge exchange.

This information will be added in the next project document.

### **Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

Stakeholders

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): Yes, however, it is strange that under section 2, private sector has not been "ticked off" when then section 4 includes some information on private sector engagement. Further, please expand the description of the activities that will be developed under the different economic sectors and associated private sector companies, in the basin.

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Cleared

**Agency Response**

040320

Private sector is not ticked off in section 2 to respond to the question of “stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase”. During the identification phase, more than 20 public and civil society organizations have participated in consultations. No private sector representatives have been consulted yet. Section 4 indicates that the project will involve private companies and during the next stages of project preparation, engagement with them is expected.

Following the Environmental and Social Framework, the project will be consulted with key stakeholders at different stages of the project. Following this framework procedures, a stakeholder engagement plan is being drafted by WCS and is being reviewed by the WB specialists to be ready for the appraisal stage.

**Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

040320

Thank you. A Gender plan is being drafted by WCS and is being reviewed by the WB specialists to be ready for appraisal stage.

**Private Sector Engagement**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): No, as indicated above, the rationale for Private sector engagement need to be expanded upon.

Particular it will be interesting to know how the private sector will be part of delivering on the overall SAP priorities, as well as the sub basin activities identified in component descriptions.

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes

**Agency Response**

040320

The project will engage with different private industries including those involving small subsistence fishermen with traditional techniques and local productivity, and medium-sized private organizations involved with fishing, agriculture, and ecotourism. Private sector engagement will be expanded. The project also expects to benefit from the identification of innovative financing instruments and possible partnerships between governments, civil society, and the private sector, as indicated in the SAP, and in relation to this basin.

## **Risks**

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

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

30th March 2020 (cseverin): A number of risks have been identified, but the implementing agency is working towards mitigating these through a number of activities and measures.

## **Agency Response**

040320

Agree. Risk analysis is conducted throughout project preparation as well as during implementation on a regular basis. A specific environmental and social risk analysis and category is provided during the different stages of project preparation by WB specialists.

## **Coordination**

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

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

30th March 2020 (cseverin): Yes, the institutional arrangement has been outlined in the submission, however, management, monitoring and evaluation could be strengthened, please do so.

Possible projects to coordinate with, have been identified in Annex 3

15th of April 2020 (cseverin): Please include a description of the formal coordination between the Putumayo investment, ASL Program, Gold Program and Amazon SAP implementation. Coordination between the different ongoing activities has been highlighted different places in the PCN, but it is not clear what is the formal mechanism for doing, so to ensure coordination and synergies are realized.

15th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

## **Agency Response**

041520

description of the formal coordination between the Putumayo proposal and other programs/projects is provided in the GEF datasheet (uploaded in the GEF portal) and online template, stakeholders engagement section. Annex D is updated in the word document GEF datasheet

040320

Details on the institutional arrangements are to be developed and included in the project appraisal document (PAD). The PAD also includes a monitoring plan that supports the results framework and an operational manual becomes a required document for project effectiveness.

## **Consistency with National Priorities**

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

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

30th March 2020 (cseverin): Yes, as it aligns with and will assist countries in implementing the ministerial endorsed Strategic Action Programme for the Amazon Basin.

## **Agency Response**

040320

In addition, the project also aligns with the national level commitments within the Minamata Convention, the Leticia Pact and its action plan, and Pucallpa Action plan signed between the Presidents of Colombia and Peru including concrete activities in the Putumayo.

#### **Knowledge Management**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): No, please include wording that describes how the project will be allocating 1% of the GEF grant to support IWLEARN activities, such as producing a website following IWLEARN standards, production of at least two experiences Notes and one Results Note, as well ensure participation of at least two project staff and minimum two representative from each country to all IWC conferences that happen during project implementation and other regional or global IWLEARN workshops.

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Text added, however, please add the "1% of GEF IW financing will be supporting IWLEARN activities". This seems to be missing.

15th of April 2020 (cseverin): Addressed

#### **Agency Response**

041020

Thank you for suggestion, In table B a specific output related to IW is added with the indication regarding the 1% budget GEF requirement

040320

As indicated in the PCN description of component 1, which has been specifically designed to foster learning and sharing, the project will build on and contribute to the GEF’s International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network (IW:LEARN) for its project-to-project learning exchanges and to leverage its targeted support for the GEF IW freshwater portfolio and partners. Supporting activities for component 3, the project will also promote communication and exchange of knowledge with the existing GOLD projects in Colombia, Ecuador and Peru for those matters that are relevant for the particular context of the basin. The current output indicated in the theory of change (annex 3) makes reference to the output: “Information, of regional relevance, available through supported platforms to facilitate decision

making processes”. The team will further develop the description of this output to make it clearer that among these platforms IWLEARN and those related to Chemicals and Waste will be included.

Thanks for the guidance on what the project needs to fund to participate in the IWLEARN according to GEF requirements. As the executing agency develops the Procurement Development strategy, Procurement Plan and budget (following fiduciary requirements) these expenses will be added.

The PIF indicates that the project has identified as one of its GEF core subindicators, the Level of engagement in IWLEARN through participation and delivery of key products, which at PIF stage is 1, as there is no involvement in IW LEARN. By the end of the project we expect to have the project site within the IWLEARN plus active participation of project staff and country representatives at International Waters conferences and the provision of spatial data and other data points via project website.

### **Part III – Country Endorsements**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): No, submission only includes one LOE, please upload all, when resubmitting

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): Yes

### **Agency Response**

040320

All LOEs are submitted

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

#### **Agency Response**

#### **GEFSEC DECISION**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

27th of March 2020 (cseverin): No, please address comments and resubmit

9th of April 2020 (cseverin): No, please address comments above and resubmit

15th of April 2020 (cseverin): No, please address the comment above and resubmit

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**



**Review Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO****Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

The Putumayo-Içá River is the tenth longest tributary of the Amazon River, and its watershed covers 118,000 km<sup>2</sup>, approximately 1.7 percent of the Amazon basin. Andean countries refer to the main river as the Putumayo. Of the large Andes-Amazon Rivers, the Putumayo-Içá is the only one without plans for large hydroelectric dams. The watershed includes some of the most remote, economically underdeveloped, lowest population density and also best conserved areas of Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru. Overall population density of the watershed is < 14 people/km<sup>2</sup>), with density declining from the upper to the lower watershed. The socioeconomic conditions and dynamics of the watershed vary along the region. The bulk of the watershed is a nearly entirely roadless wilderness, with the exception of the road network in the upper reaches in Ecuador and Colombia that supports larger towns and oil exploration and exploitation

The proposed project will be assisting the four countries to implement the strategic actions identified in the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the amazon Basin. With an objective to: “Improve the capacity of Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru to manage freshwater ecosystems and aquatic resources of the Putumayo-Ica watershed in the Amazon”, the project will support some of the priority regional transboundary problems identified in the SAP that are relevant to this basin. These actions include: addressing water and in particular Mercury pollution by implementing a regional water quality monitoring system and protecting, managing and

monitoring aquifers; deforestation by conserving and using water resources sustainably in the headwaters and lowlands and the need to support legal and institutional frameworks to improve water resources management. The project information generated through scientific and traditional knowledge will support the regional information platform that has been prioritized by the SAP.