

Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Ciénaga Grande de Santa Marta

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10567

Countries

Colombia

Project Name

Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Ciénaga Grande de Santa Marta

Agencies

IADB

Date received by PM

12/6/2021

Review completed by PM

5/10/2022

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

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

12/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

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

12/14/2021

The request for an increase in PMC is not justified based on the activities outlined which are not PMC but direct execution of project activities. Please remove and request the standard PMC.

4/18/2022

On Table B: please include the expected outcomes for M&E.

4/30/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

Agreed, the budget has been revised accordingly. The PMC has been adjusted to represent 4.7% of the GEF grant.

4/18/2022:

Agreed, we have included outcomes, indicators and outputs for M&E in table B.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/14/2021

NA.

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

12/14/2021

Please submit English translations of all the cofinancing letters. At that point we will review how the breakdown of IM and in-kind is presented.

4/18/2022

a. On the co-financing from CORPAMAG: As the amount provided, in the letter, is in Colombian Pesos please confirm the rate used to make sure the amount is accurate. As per current rates it would seem the total amounts to approximately 17.5 million dollars and not 21.8 million dollars. Alternatively, Agency can change co-financing table C in Portal to indicate a reasonable US\$ co-financing amount using current exchange rate. Please note this conversion using current exchange rate should apply for all co-financing amounts in Colombian Peso as relevant.

- b. On the co-financing from INVEMAR: as per co-financing letter it looks like all the co-financing are in-kind ? recurrent expenditures. Please correct the investment mobilized for recurrent expenditures. In addition please confirm the interest rate as the current interest rate should yield a decreased amount. Alternatively, Agency can change co-financing table C in Portal to indicate a reasonable US\$ co-financing amount using current exchange rate. Please note this conversion using current exchange rate should apply for all co-financing amounts in Colombian Peso as relevant.
- c. On the co-financing from the kingdom of Netherlands: it seems as the co-financing will be provided in the form of in-kind recurrent expenditures. If so please correct in the portal.

4/30/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

Agreed. The letters have been translated to English and uploaded in the system.

4/18/2022

- a. As mentioned in the co-financing letter addressed by CORPAMAG, the co-financing amount from CORPAMAG is COP 65,577,671,540.00 which corresponds to US\$21,859,224.00 using an exchange rate of US\$1=COP 3000. All co-financing amounts have used the same exchange rate, stipulated by the Ministry of Environment in their letter.
- b. Agreed, we have corrected the portal from investment mobilized to recurrent expenditures. The co-financing amounts have all been calculated using a exchange rate of US\$1=COP 3000. This is the amount stipulated by the Ministry of Environment in their letter of co-financing.
- c. Agreed, we have corrected the portal to reflect recurrent expenditures.

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

12/14/2021

Yes. 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

12/14/2021

NA

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

12/14/2021

There are a number of issues with the core indicator presentation.

- 1) Core indicator One has no entry for the target at CEO endorsement. Please complete.
- 2) Please complete the METT scores at the time of CEO endorsement for all protected areas as this is the project baseline upon which progress is measured.
- 3) Please explain all the changes in the values of the Core Indicators since PIF stage (many have dropped) and in particular Core Indicator.
- 4) Please complete Core Indicator 6 on GhG Emissions mitigated.
- 5) Please ensure that the final submission of core indicator is complete. Please also embed the core indicators with the Project Results Framework in Annex A aligning each core indicator target with the appropriate component.

2/14/2022

Thanks for all the changes and updates.

We note that the Agency doesn't plan to directly monitor the GHG emission mitigation of this project because the period of 5 years considered for assessing the result is rightly deemed too short. Please note that climate change benefits need to be reported for all relevant land-based projects and, as per the GEF guidelines, this indicator needs to be assessed over a 20-year period (unless an alternative number of years is considered more appropriate and justified). In addition, the Agency needs to clarify the methodology used to calculate the estimated result, taking into account this methodology needs to follow the IPPC guidelines. Please consider reporting the climate benefits under sub-indicator 6.1, revise the calculation over a 20-year period and clarify the methodology used (including the references). With regards to methodology, the Agency is invited to use and provide the Ex-ACT tool developed by FAO, which is a tool recommended by the GEF Results Architecture for GEF-7.

4/18/2022

Two protected areas WDPA ID remains blank under core indicator 1.2. Please add those, as these are mandatory at CEO Endorsement stage.

4/30/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

1) The information of Core indicator one has been completed.

2) the METT scores have been completed.

3) Only one value of the Core Indicator 4 has dropped from the PIF stage, to CEO stage. This indicator value has dropped from the PIF stage (509,135 Has) to the CEO stage (387,026 Has). This is because due to the complex environmental issues faced in the Fundaci?n and Aracataca watersheds, the country beneficiary (Ministry of Environment) decided to focalize investments in these regions, which will complement current efforts conducted by other donors. This focalized approach in Aracataca and Fundacion will create synergies that potentialize environmental benefits rather than to finance a disperse intervention. Hence, although this is a decrease in the number of Has, the analyses conducted during the design stage suggest that this geographic focalization will be able to result in environmental benefits that are more sustainable and integrated considering several areas of intervention.

4) During the project design, we have identified the potential to increase carbon sequestration by 54,386 tons CO2 . This value has been calculated based on

previous evidence and existing literature. However, this indicator will not be directly monitored as part of the project as values will be difficult to present effective changes in the 5 year period of execution. For this reason, this has been established as an environmental co-benefit of the project.

5)Agreed, Annex A has been updated with the requested information mentioned below each indicator.

3/4/2022

Agreed. The project team has modified the Core Indicator section to include an indicator for Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU sector. A complementary document has been included (Estimated Carbon Emissions Reductions of the Project). This document describes the methodology and the literature used for the estimations. Also, key output indicators that promote climate change adaptation were clarified to acknowledge their contribution (See O5; O7; O12; O13; O15; 018). The results matrix has also been updated with these changes.

After reviewing the applicability of the Ex-ACT tool, the team considers that it might not be the most appropriate methodology for this project because it is specifically designed to measure the impact of agricultural projects on GHG emissions. However, only 2 out of the 18 key outputs of this project are associated with agriculture. Hence, the project team considers that using this tool would have limited applicability in this context as it would not adequately calculate the benefits of outputs linked to forest conservation, mangrove restoration, ecosystem services or other biodiversity variables that are the central objective of this project.

4/18/2022

Agreed. We have included the WDPA ID for both protected areas.

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
12/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

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

12/14/2021

Yes. 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

12/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

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

12/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/14/2021

Yes. 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

12/14/2021

The expected global environmental benefits have declined since the PIF stage, but no discussion is presented. Please elaborate on the decline of GEBs in the final project design and why we have fewer GEBs being generated at the time of CEO endorsement.

2/4/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

Information has been updated in the GEBs section (Part II, Project Description 1.a)

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

12/14/2021

Yes. 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

12/14/2021

Yes. 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
12/14/2021

NA

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
12/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

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
12/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

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
12/14/2021

Yes. 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
12/14/2021

Please elaborate on the COVID-19 risks to project implementation and outcome achievement and outline the project mitigation strategy.

2/14/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
Agreed, a risk related to the COVID-19 and its mitigation strategy have been included in the risk section.

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
12/14/2021

Yes. 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
12/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

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
12/14/2021

Yes. 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
4/18/2022

We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate and the portal said IADB attached ESA. In the ESS section in the Portal, it said that the Environmental and Social Analysis (ESA) of the project identifies these risks and impacts, and the

Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) defines measures to manage them through a Biodiversity Plan, Indigenous Peoples Plan, Gender Equality Plan, and Health and Safety Plan, among others.

The link provided by IADB, however, does not work. IADB website provides information about ESMP of this project. Please ask IADB to provide a correct link of the ESA. If the document is available only in Spanish, please provide summary of type of risks and mitigation measures in the Portal in English.

4/30/2022

Please clarify which document includes the ESA as it is not clear from the document titles.

5/2/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/18/2022

The link has been updated the interactive platform to: <https://www.iadb.org/es/project/CO-G1014> . This link contains the updated documents of the ESA/ESMP and the Consultation process report (under Documents). The summary of the risks and the mitigation measures identified were included in the ESS section.

5/2/2022

We have added the relevant documents in the ESS section in the Portal (as uploaded documents, rather than a link). The ESA is included in the document titled "GEF10567_CO-G1014_ESSandESMP_Main". We have also included the Report from the Consultations of the ESA and ESMP.

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

4/18/2022

The budgeted amount in section 9 -Monitoring Evaluation (\$82,000) does not match the budgeted amounts for M&E in Table B and in the overall project budget (\$300,000). Please revise and include all the cost related to M&E in the budget in section 9.

4/30/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/18/2022

Agreed, section 9 has been corrected to reflect the right amount.

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

12/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/14/2021

Please enter Annex E, the project budget, directly in the portal taking care that it fits within the portal margins. At that point, the budget will be evaluated.

4/18/2022

On the Budget: please include, in Annex E, a budget template following the one that is provided in the guidelines. The purpose of the template is to promote a level playing

field across GEF Agencies, facilitate consistent review, reduce the need for follow up information requests and improve reporting on project costs.

5/5/2022

i. Please include the budget table that is in the documents? tab in the portal and do so per component instead of per outcome ? in this manner the budget table will be slimmer and will fit within the margins (the last column ?responsible entity? also has to be included)

ii. There is proposed purchase of vans, motorcycles, boats, and canoes, including the fuel and maintenance costs. Per Guidelines, these should be covered by co-financing resources - we did not find a justification explaining why these costs should not be covered by the co-financing. Please clarify.

iii. Procurement and Financial Specialist + the Coordinators of the components (3) are being charged to both project components and PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project?s execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Requesting the costs associated with the execution of the project to be covered by the PMC is reasonable ? by so doing, asking the proponents to utilize both portions allocated to PMC (GEF portion and co-financing portion) is also reasonable. That said, when the situation merits (i.e. not enough co-financing funds ? which for this projects is not the case), the project?s staff could be charged to the project?s components with ?clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component? (paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines). The co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 2.8 million, and the co-financing grants amount to 9.5 Million ? there is room to cover the costs of the project?s staff.

iv. Unspecified ?Other measures linked to the ESMP identified during execution? and ?Operating expenses linked to the project? cannot be covered by GEF funds ? these should be covered by the co-financing resources.

5/10/2022

The issues identified above with i. ? ii ? iii ? and iv) were all addressed, however, the budget table included in Annex E in Portal still is not acceptable

as it does not provide the information in one shot ? instead, the reader has to use the drop-down arrow to go up and down through the budget, but the view is limited to few rows. Please note that as requested in Guidelines, the budget has to match the same budget table appended to the documents? tab as long as it fits within the margins. Please ask the Agency to present the full budget table so whenever the project is CEO Endorsed, the document that will be posted will include a budget table complete and legible to external audiences

5/11/2022

Cleared, thank you.

Agency Response

Agreed a table with the project budget has been included in Annex E.

4/18/2022

The budget has been modified in Annex E section to follow the guidelines. A detailed budget has been included as a supporting document because the margins of the system did not allow to paste the table following the exact format provided by the GEF. Hence, a supporting document that includes all the categories and a detailed description of each activity has been uploaded (Budget-GEF Format-ENG).

5/5/2022

(1) A new Detailed Budget table was included in Annex E section addressing your comment. It is presented in a collapsed manner per component and now it includes the "responsible entity" column. We also uploaded a new version in the Roadmap section of the Portal.

(2) Indeed, the specific vehicles required for patrolling protected areas -as part of the surveillance and monitoring system- are not financed with co-financing resources, but with GEF resources (Component 2). Even though the total co-financing is quite large, it is mostly "In-Kind" co-financing, and therefore, a specific amount from this component has been allocated to be able to cover this cost. Please note that the total amount for purchasing surveillance vehicles (\$135,300), represents only 1.6% of the Total GEF project.

(3) We have rephrased the description of each category under your question to better represent and justify why these have been allocated under a specific component or under a combination of a particular component and PMC, as follows:

7.5: "Hiring of Component 1 (Governance) Technical Coordinator / Lead". Paid with resources from component 1.

7.11: "Hiring of Component 2 Technical Coordinator / Lead". Paid with resources from component 2.

7.23: "Hiring of Component 2 Technical Coordinator / Lead". Paid with resources from component 3.

7.35: ?Hiring of professional for the technical evaluation and acquisition of specialized surveillance equipment?. This professional will be dedicated exclusively to evaluate and acquire the necessary equipment for the surveillance of the protected areas required to carry out activities under component 2. It will be paid with resources from component 2 and PMC.

'7.36: ?Hiring of professional for delivering vouchers to agricultural farmers and payments to technology providers?. This professional will be fully in charge of the financial management of component 3, mainly to carry out the payments to farmers and technology providers involved in the agricultural activities. It will be paid with resources from component 3 and PMC.

The project's co-financing is mainly "in-kind" so it cannot cover these expenses.

(4) We have now clearly specified the nature of expenses under budget categories (15.1 and 15.2) within Annex E., as follows:

15.1: "Budget Reserve linked to Remediation Measures that arise from the implementation of the ESMP during execution".

15.2: "Operating expenses: rent, bank fees & telephone

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/14/2021

As noted above, please ensure that the core indicators are entered in the project results framework (Annex A) within the components that will deliver these benefits. Please make sure all figures are consistent with the core indicator numbers entered into the portal.

Please make sure the margins of Annex A stay within the portal margins.

2/14/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response Agreed. This has been checked.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/14/2021

Please respond to the STAP comments that were provided to the project and that were to be reflected in the final project design based on the project design process.

2/14/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

STAP comments sent in November 29, 2020, have been answered in Annex B.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/14/2021

NA

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/14/2021

NA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/14/2021

NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/14/2021

NA

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/14/2021

Yes. Cleared.

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

12/14/2021

NA

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

12/14/2021

NA

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

12/14/2021

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/14/2021

No. Please address all issues above and resubmit.

2/14/2022

No. Please revise Core Indicator 6 as noted above.

3/21/2022

All revisions are adequate, however, please upload the IADB project document.

3/25/2022

Please upload the project document in the English language, the operating language of the GEF.

3/24/2022

Please upload the IADB project document in English.

4/18/2022

Please address all remaining issues identified above and also address this issue:

1. On Project Information: please change the expected implementation start for a future date.

4/30/2022

Please clarify the ESA document issue identified above.

Please correct the project end date as it appears to be a typo. Currently it states this:

Expected Implementation Start

10/1/2022

Expected Completion Date

10/31/2022

5/5/2022

Please see comments above under "Annexes" with regards to the budget, its presentation, and the way certain elements are charged and revise per the comments above and resubmit.

5/10/2022

Please address the budget formatting issued noted above and resubmit.

5/11/2022

CEO endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

| | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| First Review | 12/14/2021 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 2/15/2022 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 3/21/2022 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 3/25/2022 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 5/11/2022 | |

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The general objective of the project is to improve the health of the ecosystem of the Sistema Estuarine Delta of the Magdalena River, Ciénaga Grande de Santa Marta (SDERM-CGSM) to promote the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services. The specific objectives are: (i) strengthen the environmental governance of the ecoregion in a participatory manner; (ii) promote the adoption of tools for the conservation of biodiversity, improving the connectivity of strategic ecosystems and the

efficiency of water use; and (iii) increase the area under sustainable production practices in the hydrographic basins of Aracataca and Fundaci?n.

The global environmental benefits delivered by the project will be 83,613 hectares of protected areas under improved management, 387,026 hectares of production landscapes are under improved management to benefit biodiversity, and mitigation of 469,183 metric tons of carbon.

An adequate COVID-19 mitigation plan is presented.