

Colombia's 2030 MRV Strategic Vision

Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement

Basic project information

GEF ID

10121

Countries

Regional (Colombia)

Project Name

Colombia's 2030 MRV Strategic Vision

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

7/10/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Milena Vasquez

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: At CEO endorsement, we usually expect a table that shows changes from PIF that shows how the components, outcomes and outputs (and associated amounts) have been modified and the reason for the changes. Please provide this summary table -- at the moment the changes are mentioned in different areas, making them hard to assess.

We note as well as the start date of the project is listed as June 2020. Please revise and take into account when addressing other changes in the Project Document including the work plan.

6/17/2021: Table with changes from PIF has been provided. Changes are well justified.

Start date has been changed to June 30. Considering the time for review and circulation to Council, the start date will have to be further pushed back. Please fix.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. 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 7/23/2020: Yes the project structure is appropriate.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: Not applicable as this is not an NGI project. Please remove table in Annex D.

6/17/2021: Addressed.

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected 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, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: Co-financing listed from MADS seems to have a mistake. The letter says \$1,012,996. This would have to be updated in Table C as well as in the budget in the Project Document.

6/17/2021: Co-financing from MADS continues to be wrongly listed in Table C. The letter lists \$ 2.836.390.000 pesos corresponding to USD \$ 1.012.996 in-kind, while Table C shows \$112,996. Please fix missing zero.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: We note that the financing presented in Table A differs significantly from what was provided at PIF, which why the comparative table asked for above would be helpful to assess the cost-effectiveness of the project. We note that there is no co-financing associated with the PMC, please clarify. It would be useful to separate the M&E budget from the other aspects of Component 4 in the budget table.

6/17/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 7/23/2020: Yes.

Agency Response
Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: We believe the entry for direct beneficiaries has been entered in error. We understand that the estimate has not changed from PIF and does the amount entered under "Expected at CEO Endorsement" should match the numbers under "Expected at PIF". At MTR, the number will have to be reported upon, at which stage it will be "achieved" not "expected" and again at the project's completion. At this stage this number cannot be reported. Please make sure this change is also made in the Project Document (Annex 12).

In addition, please review the explanation provided below Table E. The last sentence seems can be removed. Please add instead additional information (methodology) for how this number was estimated/how it will be achieved through the project components.

In addition, at this stage we expect the CBIT indicators to be reported upon. Please add to the project results framework or submit the CBIT tracking tool if you prefer. These are the two indicators associated with CBIT projects:

- Quality of MRV systems (1-10).
- Qualitative assessment of institutional capacity for transparency (1-4).
-
- 6/17/2021: The target for number of direct beneficiaries is not yet clear. The Core Indicator table shows only 50, while at PIF the estimate was 1500. In addition, the

explanation below the table is very confusing. Please clarify. Further, as key indicator, it should also be included in the progress results framework.

-

- CBIT indicators have now been included in the results framework Cleared.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a 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

7/23/2020: Yes, this is sufficiently elaborated.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: Please include the third BUR in the baseline scenario.

6/17/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

7/23/2020: Please address comments below:

- Consider renaming either component 1 or Output 1.1.1 which currently are essentially the same.

- It is unclear how the project will promote and strengthen institutional arrangements over time. Please clarify.

- Outcome 1.1: The introduction of Component 1 mentions that this activity would enable the updating of instruments such as activity data protocols, emission factors,

uncertainty calculations, data compiling, archiving and quality assurance/control?? and ?black carbon calculation spreadsheets will be revised?. However, the Outputs/outcomes do not detail how this will be achieved. In this context for Output 1.1.2: please provide specific details. For example, it is not clear what information exchange protocols and tools include.

- Outcome 1.2: This mentions a training program for ?key data providers? including DANE and Agrosavia. Please align with the stakeholder engagement plan and the stakeholder section in the Portal.
- Output 1.2.1 mentions training program along with developing methodological protocols. Output 1.2.2 mentions statistical methodologies for uncertainty estimate. Please clarify how these activities are different and separate.
- Outcome 1.3: This outcome is meant to ?strengthen capacities on gender perspective?. Specifically Output 1.3.1 mentions tools to mainstream gender approach. Please provide additional details and clarification on what this means. Output 1.3.3 and Output 1.3.4: It is unclear what this output is aiming to do ? for example, is it aiming at training more women for information collection, is it training the core team to adopt indicators to showcase gender differences and how would this be done in the context of accounting and estimation? For Output 1.3.4 it is unclear what the objective of the report is. Please clarify. In this component, some of the outputs/outcomes focus on AFOLU and Energy sector while some other focus on additional sectors such as IPPU, Waste. Please provide a rationale for this.

- Component 2, Output 2.1.3: Apart from training, please provide additional details on how the procedures will be established for information collection, reporting and validation such as developing reporting templates, establishing processes for validation and reporting, etc. Additionally since there will be interaction with companies please ensure that this is detailed in the stakeholder section of the portal and the Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

- Outcome 2.3 mentions engagement with several entities such as Fedegan, PorkColombia and Fenavi and others. Please clarify their engagement in the stakeholder engagement plan.

- Component 3 envisions engagement with the private sector. Please include in the private sector section of the portal and the stakeholder engagement plan.

- Component 3 is a critical outcome to monitor progress. Additional details have been fleshed out in the multi-year work program section of the PAD. Please elaborate these in the portal to provide additional clarity on what these entail.

- Output 3.1: Revise timeline where it says first quarter 2020

- Output 3.2: Please clarify how this relates to Output 1.2.2. additionally, please clarify what is meant by a pilot in this context (as the outputs relate to two documents).

- Output 3.2.2 (Scenarios and projections until 2030 are calculated) has been removed from the CEO Endorsement Request. Please provide additional details on the rationale of removing this, or if it is included in another output please elaborate.

Component 4

- Output 4.3.2 might fit better under Output 4.2. Also please provide additional details on how Colombia may consider knowledge sharing on an ongoing basis, as a leader in the region but also with all the various initiatives along with CBIT that it is undertaking.

- Output 4.3.1 and Output 4.3.2: Please clarify what these will entail, and those that had have a gender angle ? please clarify how these reports will be different from the above reports mentioned. Also indicate how these reports might be used to make the project more impactful.

6/27/2021: Comments above have been addressed sufficiently. However, please provide answers for comments in the review page of the Portal, for this and all other questions.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: Please strengthen this section. Consider mapping (possibly in a tabular format) the various initiatives in Colombia, their focus area, and how this CBIT fills in the gaps for Colombia's vision for an enhanced transparency framework. You may want to consider providing details on capacity building needs analysis that have been conducted by other entities such as the UNFCCC technical analysis of BURs as well.

6/17/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: Please provide additional details on what is new for the Colombia context which will highlight further the innovation aspect of this question. Additionally, the portal mentions IDEAM's collaborative model and the positive effect on institutional

arrangements, and the role this approach plays. Please clarify. Please provide additional details on the potential for scaling up.

6/17/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response
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

7/23/2020: Please check with IT if how to submit a project map that the portal accepts.

6/17/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response
Child Project

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response
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

7/23/2020: No information on how stakeholders were engaged during the project design phase is provided. In addition, a table of relevant stakeholders and their roles is missing on the portal submission. Please provide, building on what is included in the Project

document, ensuring that it aligns and mentions all stakeholders mentioned in the various activities (and outlined in various sections above) including the private sector. Apart from the stakeholder listing, the plan should include the means of engagement and dissemination of information among others.

The project document also mentions formal agreements with private sector. This does not align with the response in #4 on private sector engagement. Please align and clarify.

6/17/2021: Please review this section of the Portal submission. The first part should address how stakeholders were consulted during the project design phase. We also expect a report on these consultations in the Project Document. The second part should include the information on the stakeholders that will be engaged during implementation (including the table which has now been provided). We also note that Fundacion Natura is missing from the table.

Agency Response

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

7/23/2020: Gender assessment is provided in the Project Documents and gender has been included in the project itself.

Agency Response

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

7/23/2020: Per the comments above, additional information on private sector engagement aligned with what is included in other parts of the project is needed. Please provide additional details.

6/17/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

7/23/2020: Please include climate change risks, as well as the current COVID crisis.

6/17/2021: Comments above have not been sufficiently addressed. Please provide additional details, also update information on COVID (a vaccine has been developed now).

Agency Response

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

7/23/2020: It is not clear if IDEAM/MADs is the executing agency or if it is Fundacion Natura. Please clarify the roles as at the top of the portal it states that Fundacion Natura is the executing agency while under institutional arrangements it is IDEAM and MADs. This section needs to clarify these arrangements.

Please provide a further elaboration how this CBIT project will coordinate and leverage on the various relevant initiatives in Colombia

6/17/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: Alignment with NDC is notably missing in this section - please add.

6/17/2021: We see the added text, but it is still missing specific information on the updated NDC. Please add. Further, please update the different sections to reflect the submission of Colombia's First NDC.

Agency Response
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

7/23/2020: The KM approach in the PAD describes how the project ?will codify good practices and facilitate dissemination through global ongoing South-South and global platforms, such as Africa Solutions Platform, the UN South-South Galaxy knowledge sharing platform and PANORAMA?. Please provide these details and capture in the portal. Please update Component 4 accordingly as well.

6/17/2021: Comment above cleared. Please include a budget in this section.

6/17/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response
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

7/23/2020: Thank you for submitting the assessment. We note that the gender section in the assessment seems to be empty. Please clarify and update.

6/17/2021: Comment above cleared. In the Portal, please provide a summary of ESS.

Agency Response
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

7/23/2020: Yes a budgeted M&E plan is provided. Overall, the budget seems high for this type of project. Please clarify. Please comment on the budget allocated to the project board meetings, which seem to be high. Also see comment above regarding the separation between the budgeted M&E activities and the other activities under Component 4.

6/17/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

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

7/23/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

See below.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: Please add the missing CBIT indicators.

The Project Results Framework, Component 3, second indicator mentions "Number of scenarios and projections made for the Energy and AFOLU sectors that support the work processes of the NDC of Colombia". It is not clear how this aligns with the current description of the component. Please clarify.

6/17/2021: Comment cleared. Please make sure the table fits properly in the Portal so that if printed it does not get cut off.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: Please address comments from the GEF secretariat that say "By CEO endorsement", where our comment on CBIT indicators was first raised.

6/17/2021: These comments and responses have not been added to the Portal.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: Please address comments from Council which are missing. See below:

Norwegian-Danish's Comments:

"Regarding the project "Colombia's 2030 MRV Strategic Vision", we would like to ask UNDP to ensure coordination with other relevant programs such as UN-REDD and its support to MRV-activities.

"The program document should clarify what is meant by the 500,000 USD "in-kind" co-financing from UK, Norway and Germany

"We are pleased to see that gender is addressed specifically and activities identified for follow-up

6/17/2021: While these were added, the response to the 500,000 USD in-kind co-financing from UK, Norway and Germany is not properly addressed. Please clarify that this co-financing identified at PIF is no longer included in the Project.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 7/23/2020: This has been provided.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 7/23/2020: Please submit appropriate map.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: Please remove KM table from this section.

6/17/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/23/2020: Please address comments above.

6/17/2021: Please address remaining comments. In addition, please provide responses in the review sheet in the Portal and un-highlight the text in the Portal for final review. We note that the ProDoc does not include the project budget. Please add and resubmit.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/23/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/17/2021	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**