

Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Cienaga Grande de Santa Marta

Basic Information

GEF ID

10567

Countries

Colombia

Project Title

Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Cienaga Grande de Santa Marta

GEF Agency(ies)

IADB

Agency ID

IADB: CO-G1014

GEF Focal Area(s)

Biodiversity

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

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

3-26-20

The project is said to be aligned with the BD-1-1 Objective "Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors". While the landscape is well defined (Fundación and Aracataca River watersheds), it is not clear what Biodiversity measures are being embedded in the "agricultural farming and livestock" sectors to deliver GEBs. A test will be to describe how the landscapes will look like after the conclusion of the project. There is also emphasis on "improved water management" and that is not under the GEF-7 BD Strategy

An outcome in Component 1 (Improved management effectiveness in 175,000 ha of three (3) national protected areas (SFF CGSM, PNN SNSM and VIPIS), tells that the project is not only about mainstreaming. But there are no interventions to improve the METT of the NPs.

9/24/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response The PIF document was adjusted to outline a better alignment to the GEF Biodiversity Strategy and project's mechanism to deliver the GEB.

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

3-26-20

COMPONENT 1

1. There are far too many Outcomes (N=5) for an equal number of Outputs (N=5). The sum of the outputs should allow the delivery of the measurable outcomes with clear indicators.
2. Given that the GEF has already piloted sustainable agro-forestry, agriculture, and livestock practices (agro-silvopastoral) in several projects that Colombia has learned from, the GEF would expect that they would be scaled up without further support as this is the approach: demonstrate and pilot new approaches and technologies for the Government and other development partners to disseminate and scale out and up.
3. Most of what is being proposed under this component are agricultural activities and restoration with no measurable global biodiversity benefits. The actions listed would be part of the sustainable development baseline which GEF would not fund.
4. Regarding the ecological corridor. What is being connected considering the degraded status of the natural ecosystems? *"...connecting the SNSM National Park and indigenous reservations of the upper watershed with the water bodies of the CGSM and the CGSM protected area"*.
5. The GEF doesn't understand this outcome under Component 1: *1.3 Lower expenses associated with the use of agro-chemicals by beneficiary farms*. What is the relationship with the BD Strategy?
6. Regarding *"Improved connectivity, implementation of sustainable production practices and biodiversity management"*: What Connectivity and what biodiversity management is this referring to? *The implementation of sustainable agro-ecological production practices in livestock and agricultural farms* sound like technical assistance to the local farmers. The GEF does not believe that there are any biodiversity returns on this kind of investment which generates mainly local benefits.
7. Regarding *"high value conservation ecosystems under conservation and restoration"*, please locate and identify these.

COMPONENT 2

As in Component 1, there as many Outcomes as Outputs.

8. This component is mostly focused on water management and water agreements and studies about water management. Not eligible under the BD Strategy.
9. (2.2) Improved management effectiveness by 10% in 156,000 ha of three (3) national protected areas (SFF CGSM, PNN SNSM and

VIPIS). What investments are being proposed that will result in this improvement as we see none?

10. The PNN Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta (SNSM) is out of the target area according to the map. *One (1) protected area delimitation study performed for a prioritized sector of conflict*. What PA and what delimitation? The GEF doesn't think there are areas available and valuable for a new PA.

11. *One (1) planning instrument with biodiversity conservation objectives considering the traditional views of the indigenous groups*. What is the target area?

12. Oil Palm mentioned in the project (related to water management) but no proposed interventions described in the Component.

13. Will any conservation contracts, biodiversity management plans or the like be included in component 2? Clarify the meaning of *conservation contracts* in the Colombian context.

4-16-20

- 1) The project has very few Globally Significant Biodiversity Benefits. What is presented in the project are mostly national benefits (See comment on Protected Areas).
- 2) The project is mostly about water management (mentioned in 5 of the 9 outputs), and most of the proposed interventions are not related to Biodiversity conservation, except Mangrove Restoration and Ecological corridor (not clear what this corridor is connecting). Biodiversity conservation as the focus of the project is not there (reads as an afterthought). Riparian forests are mentioned mostly associated with restoring water flows.
- 3) The project includes 3 National Parks and the Results Framework and one of the outcomes is the Improved management effectiveness in 175,000 ha of three (3) national protected areas: SFF CGSM, PNN SNSM, and VIPIS. Nevertheless, the investments to make this happen are not clear (they are not even mentioned in the description of the Components). As an example: What is being proposed to *Improved conservation of 41 threatened vertebrate and plant species and 162 endemic vertebrate and plant species, associated with the three PAs*?
- 4) Under Global Benefits it says: *509,000 hectares of landscapes with strategic or underrepresented ecosystems in the SINAP under improved practices; these include mangroves, paramos, dry tropical forest and Andean forests*. What are the proposed interventions in paramos and Andean forests? Mentioned once and twice respectively. No associated interventions.
- 5) There is also reference to agriculture and livestock without elaborating of what will be done and how those interventions will result in BD benefits. Not clear how the project will deliver 26,000 hectares under agroecological management, by means of *"Conservation agreements and the implementation of incentives with water users in the Fundación and Aracataca river watersheds"*. The statement *Regarding biodiversity management, although this term is not included in the PIF, it is understood as an integral aspect of sustainable agricultural practices* exemplifies the weakness of the proposition and the point.

4-17-20

Here are some general and specific issues that relate to the structure of the project

- 1) The project has very few Globally Significant Biodiversity Benefits. What is presented in the project are mostly national benefits (See comment on Protected Areas). While the CGSM is a very large and important wetland for Colombia, the end results of the project that would result from the proposed interventions don't deliver the global BD benefits that one would expect for a Megadiverse country.

- 2) The project is mostly about water management (mentioned in 5 of the 9 outputs), and most of the proposed interventions are not related to Biodiversity conservation, except Mangrove Restoration and Ecological corridor (not clear what this corridor is connecting). Biodiversity conservation as the focus of the project is not there (reads as an afterthought). Riparian forests are mentioned mostly associated with restoring water flows.
- 3) The project includes 3 National Parks and the Results Framework and one of the outcomes is the Improved management effectiveness in 175,000 ha of three (3) national protected areas: SFF CGSM, PNN SNSM, and VIPIS. Nevertheless, the investments to make this happen are not clear (they are not even mentioned in the description of the Components). As an example: What is being proposed to *Improved conservation of 41 threatened vertebrate and plant species and 162 endemic vertebrate and plant species, associated with the three PAs?*
- 4) Under Global Benefits it says: *509,000 hectares of landscapes with strategic or underrepresented ecosystems in the SINAP under improved practices; these include mangroves, paramos, dry tropical forest and Andean forests.* What are the proposed interventions in paramos and Andean forests? Mentioned once and twice respectively. No associated interventions.
- 5) There is also reference to agriculture and livestock without elaborating of what will be done and how those interventions will result in BD benefits. Not clear how the project will deliver 26,000 hectares under agroecological management, by means of *"Conservation agreements and the implementation of incentives with water users in the Fundación and Aracataca river watersheds"*. The statement *Regarding biodiversity management, although this term is not included in the PIF, it is understood as an integral aspect of sustainable agricultural practices* exemplifies the weakness of the proposition and the point.

Please see comments on under RECOMMENDATION

9/24/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

Answer to comment no. 1. Agree. The outcomes were reduced and adjusted for three project components.

Answer to comment no. 2. This action corresponds to component 2. Although practices and technologies have been developed and tested on previous projects and in other countries, their adoption is still limited. This is one of the barriers that the project will address. This project will play a key role in fostering an enabling environment to scale up sustainable production practices to a broader number of farmers. The design phase will identify and test the right incentives to trigger the adoption of sustainable practices, including better access to technical

assistance, social acknowledgment, access to financing/ insurance, among others. A public-private partnership will be established to close

the gaps for financing, technology availability, technical assistance, markets, among others, and this scheme will be pilot in two watersheds. An impact evaluation (component 3) will be performed to measure the causal effects of the intervention. These findings will reduce the existing knowledge gap in the development effectiveness of the project interventions.

Answer to comment no. 3. The first component aims to strengthen the governance model in the CGSM. The answer provided is for the agricultural activities under component 2.

There is a consensus in the national and international scientific community that the hydrological disruption is the main threat to biodiversity in the CGSM. As stated in the document, the freshwater from the SNSM is vital for the hydrological dynamics of the ecosystem. The unsustainable use of water resources and deforestation by the agriculture sector is the primary driver of change in the tributary basins of the CGSM. Thus, work with the productive sector to restore the riparian forest and the water flows are critical for biodiversity conservation. Moreover, the conservation/restoration agreements are futile if substantial changes are not made in the production systems. The lessons learned from previous projects and literature (worldwide) show that alternatives must be provided to increase productivity and family income to achieve conservation goals. See "Alteration of the hydrodynamic system of the CGSM", Page 19.

Answer to comment no. 4. The project will focus its efforts on restoring the riparian forest in the middle and lower basins to reestablish the water inflows to the CGSM, but this will have a direct impact on the other high-value ecosystems, such as mangroves and Dry Tropical Forest, and associated biodiversity. In order to pursue a holist approach, the restoration of the riparian forest will be accompanied by improvement of agricultural practices, multi-stakeholder agreement for water management and water allocation system that considers the needs from the CGSM, among other activities. Finally, according to the watershed management plans and connectivity studies performed by NPS, the upper watershed is well conserved, the middle basin retains about 50% of the forest cover, and the low basin has lost most of its forest cover. See additional information in the answer to comment No.6.

Answer to comment no. 5. This indicator is not included in the project proposal.

Answer to comment no. 6. The first component aims to strengthen the governance model in the CGSM. The answer provided is for the agricultural activities under component 2.

The connectivity between the high-mountain ecosystems of the SNSM and the wetlands of the CGSM are an important factor for maintaining, in the long run, the GEB in the area. For this reason, the area of connectivity between the CGSM and the SNSM has been recently identified as one with the highest priority in terms of protection, restoration, and other complementary uses, as well as one of the two areas in the Caribbean where PAs structural and functional connectivity is still possible (FAO, 2019). See additional information in the answer to the comment No. 4, component 2 – page 27, Project map of the project – Page 35, and section 7, page 43 in PIF document.

Regarding biodiversity management, although this term is not included in the PIF, it is understood as an integral aspect of sustainable agricultural practices. The production system must be addressed as a "whole" to be more successful in the adoption of the practices. The project will promote the transformation to sustainable production systems that have a positive impact on habitat provision for wild species. If managed sustainably, agricultural sectors can contribute to important ecosystem functions, for example, keeping land covers and native nectariferous plants will improve soil quality crossed pollination, water use, and yield productivity, as well as reducing the need for

agrochemicals. These measures also will improve the landscape's permeability, diversity of insects, and biodiversity mobility.

The project will not just provide technical assistance for sustainable production; the project will identify, implement and assess a comprehensive scheme with different incentives to foster adoption and scale-up of the sustainable production practices, which include conservation measures in private lands.

Answer to comment no. 7. This information is presented in-depth in the document (See global environmental benefits section 31 in the PIF document – page 30 and). The high-value conservation ecosystems refer to riparian forests (high, middle and low basins), Andean forests and sub-Andean forests (high basin) dry tropical forests (middle and lower basins) and mangroves (lower basin) of the Fundacion and Aracataca watersheds.

Answer to comment no. 8. The second component aims to increase ecological and hydrological connectivity between the CGSM and the SNSM, by supporting conservation, restoration, and sustainable production activities. The answer provided is for the water studies proposed under the first component.

As stated in the document, the component objective is to improve and implement the governance scheme for the CGSM. The governance model and project intervention should be relevant to the priorities of the local stakeholders and respond to the socio-ecological dynamics and agendas under implementation to effectively link the conservation goals of the CGSM. The water management in agricultural farming and livestock activities are critical issues for the local communities and to the hydrological balance, on which the health of the mangroves and the biodiversity in CGSM relied on. Finally, most of the resources will be invested to improve the governance model, and the water allocation studies will not represent more than 15% of the budget but are a critical tool to control the water use and ensure the freshwater inflow to the CGSM. See component 1, in the 25 and 26 pages in the PIF document.

Answer to comment no. 9. The project will invest in strengthening the governance model for the CGSM (component 1), implement a monitoring system, water management agreement in two tributaries watersheds, water allocations systems that consider biodiversity needs, and the implementation of a scheme for sustainable production. These actions will have an impact on 13 variables assessed by the METT in the PAs, the most important contributions will be in: (i) the planning process allows an adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan; (ii) information to manage the area; (iii) equipment for management needs; (iii) land and water use planning recognizes the protected area; (iv) co-operation with adjacent land and water users; (v) local communities, indigenous and traditional peoples have input to management decisions; (iv) mitigation of the threats to the conservation goals; and (iv) monitoring. For more detailed information see components 1 and 2, pages 13 and 14.

Answer to comment no. 10. The west flank of the PNN Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta (SNSM) and its buffer zone are part of the project intervention area. See Project Map – page 35.

The PA delimitation is not included in the project proposal.

Answer to comment no. 11. This is not included in the project proposal. However, the project does expect to actively incorporate the organizations of the Arhuaco and Kogui indigenous peoples of SNSM in the implementation of conservation and sustainable production activities.

Answer to comment no. 12. The project seeks to design and implement a scheme to scale up sustainable production practices that improve

Answer to comment no. 12. The project seeks to design and implement a scheme to scale-up sustainable production practices that improve habitat provision for wild species. The oil palm and other agricultural producers (rice, banana, coffee, etc.) present in the watersheds will be part of the project. Because the agricultural sector consumes most of the water available in the watersheds. As stated in the PIF document,

good practices and technologies have been tested and adapted by guilds and research center and the project will create an enabling environment to increase adoption and scale-up. For example, mulching, piezometer placing, water requirement according to crop age, efficient irrigation, among others, are recommended by the Guild and research centers Palm Oil plantations.

Answer to comment no. 13. Agree. More information was included. See component 2, page 29 in the PIF document. The water users (producers) will sign the agreements with the local environmental authority to receive the incentives for sustainable production (that includes conservation/restoration activities). Under the agreements, water users are expected to implement water conservation actions and/or sustainable practices and restoration of natural ecosystems in private lands. The agreement will be for at least 5 to 10 years and will have specific targets (i.e., ha under conservation, restoration, ha under agroecological practices, etc.) that will be monitored through the component 1.

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

3-26-20

There are 6 in-kind co-financing labeled "Investment Mobilized". In-kind should be "Recurrent Expenditure".

Following on the above, the co-financing is \$25.2 million "Recurrent Expenditure" and \$16.2 million "Investment Mobilized".

9/24/2020

Please clarify why you are unable to identify the type of cofinancing for the following Private Sector actors even though you know the exact amounts of the investment mobilized by each:

Association of Banana growers (BANASAN and others)

Committee of Coffee Growers of Magdalena

Private Sector National Federation of Cattle Ranchers – FEDEGAN

Sector National Federation of Palm Oil Producers – FEDEPALMA

10/5/2020

In-kind recurrent co-financing such as government staff salaries, office space, operating costs are considered recurrent expenditures, whereas capital investments and equipment purchase are considered investment mobilized.

Thus, please correct the way you have labeled the cofinancing. For example, some times the project labels in-kind as recurrent expenditures which is correct. Other times in kind is labeled as investment mobilized. Please revise and correct.

10/10/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

Agree. The funds were appropriately categorized.

9/30/2020

The type of cofinancing was adjusted for BANASAN, FEDEGAN, and Fedepalma, based on the information available at this stage.

10/7/2020

The type of cofinancing was adjusted according to the GEF-Sec recommendation.

10/20/20

Bilateral meetings were held with relevant stakeholders to identify the financing resources and their kind. The resources corresponding to staff, equipment, and facilities that will help achieve the project's goal were classified as recurrent expenditures. The activities already included in the public institution's annual budget to implement their official duties were also considered recurrent expenditures (.e.g., a National Park receives financial support from the national government for patrolling activities).

Partners' future investments to carry out the studies, works, community projects, equipment, hiring new technical support, etc. contributing to the project outcomes were considered investment mobilized. These actions are not financed by a regular income source and are not included in the current budget allocations. For example, cooperation agreements between public and private organizations to finance specific projects, carry out studies and research, access national funds (National Oil Royalty Program), etc. Furthermore, the reallocation of current resources and new investments from the agricultural and private sectors to support the project were also considered investment

current resources and new investments from the agricultural and private sectors to support the project were also considered investment mobilized.

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

3-26-20

Yes

Cleared

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/24/2020

Yes

Cleared

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/24/2020

Yes

Cleared

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/24/2020

na

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/24/2020

na

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/24/2020

na

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/24/2020

na

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

3-26-20

No PPG request.

Cleared

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

3-26-20

STATED BEFORE BUT RELEVANT TO THIS QUESTIONS TOO. The Project indicates the improved management of 175,911 ha of three National Parks (Ciénaga Grande De Santa Marta, Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta and The Park Way Isla de Salamanca). What are the proposed investments to ensure that the METT of these parks would increase as the result of the project?

The project is also claiming 20,000 ha in Restoration and an staggering 509,136 ha of landscapes under improved practices. Is that a realistic target? Please clarify how the improve management of more than 1/2 million hectares result in Globally Significant Biodiversity Benefits.

9/24/2020

10/5/2020

The core indicators are not showing up in the portal. Please enter them.

Please ensure that the numbers entered in the portal are consistent with all the numbers presented in the actual PIF document as it is not clear what the project is claiming as total impact as measured in hectares as it appear different in Table B (about ,000 hectares) when compared to the GEBs presentation (about 117,000 hectares). With an investment of this size and the nature of the actions taken, we expect considerable area being positively impacted by the investment.

Please include the METT scores for the PAs that will benefit from the project, also including the names of the PAs. The total area of the PAs should be included in the core indicators dealing with improving management effectiveness.

10/5/2020

Adequate clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

See answer to comment 9 for contributions to management effectiveness.

The GEF-Sec recommended in the previous review: *"The draft core indicator target for biodiversity hectarage is 400,000 ha, which is a very low Return on Investment for an \$8.2 million (GEF), \$41 million (co-finance) land-based project. This is an extraordinary amount of money to invest in a small area with hardly any global biodiversity benefits"*. The government adjusted the project to increase in 40% the target area, by focusing the scope, including direct actions in one more watershed (Aracataca) and coordinating with co-financing to add another watershed (Rio Frio-Sevilla), to have a full impact on the west flank of PNN SNSM. Additionally, it was established the effects of improving the hydrological dynamics in the CGSM and its consequences to the SFF CGSM and VPIS. All the mentioned actions to have a clear idea of the project intervention area.

With regards to the area of restoration, 20,000 hectares were estimated by adding 3,000 hectares of conservation areas of participating farms (15% of the total 20,000 hectares expected to be included in the project), 1,650 hectares of mangrove restored by improving hydrological connections (50% of 3,300 ha influenced by the restoration activities) and 15,350 hectares of indigenous areas under restoration.

See Global Environmental Benefit section – page 30 and 31, in the PIF document.

9/30/2020

The hectares registered in Table B, Core indicators, GEB, and Map sections, were reviewed and updated. The information required at the PIF stage (name, UICN category, and Ha) for benefited Protected Areas is complete. The METT scores for PAs will be estimated and included at the CEO Endorsement stage because we do not have the right to edit the METT Score column (baseline at CEO endorsement) at the current 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

3-26-20

Please indicate where Table G is or upload if missing.

9/24/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response The table is included in the portal, but it will be also submitted as an attachment.

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

3-26-20

The project states that one of the causes of the hydrodynamic disruption in the local watersheds and wetlands of the CGSM, including the watersheds of the SNSM western flank, is deforestation:

"The SNSM was identified as one of the eight (8) deforestation centers in the country in the first quarter of 2017. For the Caribbean region, the main cause of deforestation is the implementation of pastures for cattle, as a land-grabbing strategy to obtain land tenure rights"

"In the Aracataca watershed, deforestation due to the expansion of the agricultural frontier promotes land transformation from the natural ecosystem coverage to pastures (37,110 ha), and agricultural crops (4,564 ha), especially to African palm in the lower basin (CORPAMAG,

2015).

If these are some of the threats, it is not clear what the project is proposing on doing about them.

9/24/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response The document was adjusted to provide more context to deforestation and its causes. See page 19.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3-26-20

The information provided under the Baseline Scenario is the Background information (history) not the Baseline Project as defined by the GEF. The Baseline Projects are the upcoming projects (investments) that will take place in the target geography whether or not the GEF project is approved. These are the projects on which the GEF project will stand to provide incremental funding to deliver GEBs. What are these projects?

9/24/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response Agree. This section was adjusted and improved.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3-26-20

While the Alternative Scenario and Component present the expected outcomes, they don't deliver Global Biodiversity Benefits and/or are eligible for GEF funding under the BD Strategy. See detailed review of the Components above.

9/24/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response This information is presented in-depth in the document (See Global Environmental Benefit section – page 30 and 31, in the PIF document). The high-value conservation ecosystems refer to riparian forests (high, middle and low basins), Andean forests and sub-Andean forests (high basin) dry tropical forests (middle and lower basins) and mangroves (lower basin) of the Fundacion and Aracataca watersheds

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3-26-20

No. The project is suppose to be a mainstreaming project but there is no reference to the proposed interventions that will embed Biodiversity measures into the productive sector AND deliver BD Globally Significant Benefits.

9/24/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

The project intervention is based and aligned to the GEF Biodiversity strategy, which recognizes as a priority: "Improving and changing production practices to be more biodiversity-positive with a focus on sectors that have significant biodiversity impacts (agriculture) and implementation of financial that incentivize actors to change current practices that may be degrading biodiversity". Moreover, this strategy establishes that "...in order for biodiversity mainstreaming to generate impacts at the scale necessary to advance progress in achieving the related Aichi Biodiversity Targets, a series of investments by GEF that are strategically nestled within a larger-scale national planning and

management framework is often required...”.

Sustainable production practices and technologies have been developed and tested on previous projects, and in other countries, however, their adoption and the scale-up process are still limited. This is one of the barriers that the project will address. This project will play a key role in fostering an enabling environment to scale up sustainable production practices to a broader number of farmers. And through performing an impact evaluation (component 3), the existing knowledge gap will be reduced and will guide future public investments for sustainable production transformation. See the answer to comment no. 2 for more detailed information.

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

3-26-20

No. Without a clear Baseline, it is not possible to provide the incremental reasoning.

9/24/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response The baseline section was adjusted.

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

3-26-20

As stated before, the Biodiversity Benefits of Global Significant are not clear in the project as stated above. While there is reference to 3 National Parks, there are no investments associated with these areas. The Benefits of the investments in the 509,136 ha of landscapes under improved practices are not clear either.

9/24/2020

As noted above under the core indicators, please ensure consistency throughout the PIF on the hectares impacted by the investment.

It remains unclear due to different presentations of numbers, how large an area will be impacted. Once this is clear, we may have further comments on these issues.

10/5/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response See the answers to comments No. 9 and No.15.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3-26-20

The project states that the main innovation brought forth by the project will be to bring together the key stakeholders. That is not an innovation; That is the way any project should be put together. The only innovation in the project is the use of new drone and passive acoustic technologies for monitoring and controlling illegal activities.

The statement that "the sustainability of the project is given by the extent to which the different stakeholders appropriate and internalize the lessons learned from the project implementation, including cooperation between them" is a very weak. What about the financial sustainability?

9/24/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response The PIF document was adjusted to clarify the innovation behind creating a governance model and scheme to scale up sustainable production.

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

3-26-20

There is a map, but the target area includes geographies that are outside of the geography that will benefit from interventions (Fundación and Aracataca river watersheds).

9/24/2020

The map can not be read. Can you please either submit something with better refinement or include an attachment that is legible.

10/5/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

Agree. The map was adjusted to identify the project intervention area.

9/30/2020

The Map was updated in the portal, but it will be also submitted as an attachment.

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

Please only list the stakeholder that will have direct roles in the project. Remove the ones that will not participate. For each of the stakeholder in the Table please indicate if they know of the project and that have been listed in the GEF project.

9/24/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response Agree. The stakeholder list was adjusted.

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

3-26-20

Yes

Cleared

9/24/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

10/20/20

The gender section was strengthened to show better the project actions regarding gender mainstreaming in the first and second components.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3-26-20

The Private Sector companies that need to be engaged in the project are clearly indentified.

Cleared

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

3-26-20

Cleared

9/24/2020

Please describe how COVID-19 is addressed in the project from a risk management standpoint including associated impacts of COVID-19 and how these risks will be mitigated particularly within the context of delivering GEBs. This should cover the design and implementation stages of the project.

10/5/2020

Please provide a more fulsome discussion on the risk of climate change to the project area and the project objectives in and of itself as opposed to the very sparse description provided which focuses on the impact of climate change on stakeholder participation.

Please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening (link below) and provide a more robust climate risk screening. At a minimum, the climate risks should be identified, listed and described. This can include:

- a.) Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location (or as close to it with data available), which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc).
- b.) Time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050). Please refer to list of examples from STAP guidance.
- c.) Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above (describe how the climate scenarios identified above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050).
- d.) Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and mitigation measures during PPG.

(<https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>)

10/10/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

9/30/2020

Risk and potential mitigation measures for COVID-19 were included in the PIF, both for the design and execution stages.

10/7/2020

The MADS and IDB screened the risks of climate change to the project intervention area during the PIF preparation, based on the findings of the "Plan for Climate Change Management in the Department of Magdalena" (attached). The risk section was improved to identify and describe the potential risks and mitigations actions for the project's design and implementation.

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

3-26-20

Please provide the names of the institutions that are likely to run the project and responsible for the management and M&E.

9/24/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response Agree. The institutions and the monitoring arrangement were included.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and

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

3-26-20

The information provided in the session applies to the entire geography of the country. Please refer to a National Priority Document (or at least Departmental Priorities) referencing the target areas

9/24/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response Agree. This section was adjusted.

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

3-26-20

The budget of \$450,000 to deliver the 3 outputs and the 1 outcome is excessive.

9/24/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response Agree. The budget was adjusted to \$300,000. See component 3, page 28.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/24/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

art 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

3-26-20

Yes. Project and Fees are the same in Portal and LoE

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Total Amount (in US\$)			
			Project preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEFTF	IADB	Biodiversity	0	8.219.178	780.822	9.000.000
Total GEF				8.219.178	780.822	9.000.000

Total GEF Resources		8,219,178	780,822	9,000,000
----------------------------	--	------------------	----------------	------------------

Programming Directions	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-1-1	GET	8,219,178	41,355,000
	Total Project Cost (\$)	8,219,178	41,355,000

Cleared

Agency Response

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

9/24/2020

NA

Agency Response

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

2-26-20

No. This PIF is not recommended for Technical Clearance.

The GEF suggest to organize a conference call to discuss this Review and next steps.

4-17-20

A sample of the outstanding issues of the project were listed under Item 2.

After a conversation with the Agency on the structure of the project and elaborating on the points listed in this review that were selected to illustrate some of the outstanding issues of the project, the GEF would like to suggest reconsidering the geographic location and/or the angle that was used to assembly the project. Possibilities include relocating the project to a setting that offers a better balance between national- and globally significant biodiversity benefits and/or refocusing the project to deliver other global environmental benefits related to other GEF-7 strategies like the Land Degradation Strategy. The GEF will be happy to convene a conference call when the team considers its options for a GEF project and before starting to redraft the current project or drafting a new one altogether.

9/24/2020

No, the PIF is not recommended for technical clearance. Please address the issues identified above and resubmit.

10/5/2020

No, the PIF is not recommended for technical clearance. Please address the issues identified above on cofinancing and climate risk screening and resubmit.

10/14/2020

A few issues remain:

1- The LoE specifies that besides CI, the other executing partner is the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development but the Ministry is missing in Portal – please add the agency in the Poral.

2- On Co-financing: The description field includes a general description of the process whereby co-financing was identified. In addition, please describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and

identified. In addition, please describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures" for different sources of co-financing. For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf).

3- On Gender Equality: While the project outlines some indicative plans to provide women in the CGSM equal access to participation (through pursuing a "household approach"), the project lacks any indicative information on gender dimensions as they relate to conservation and governance in the CGSM. Please provide some additional information on gender dimensions (e.g. related to participation, decision-making and/or natural resource management) relevant to the project objective and activities.

10/20/20

Yes. PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

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
First Review	3/26/2020	4/14/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/16/2020	9/30/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/17/2020	10/7/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/24/2020	10/20/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/10/2020	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The project aims to improve the ecosystem health of the Ciénaga Grande de Santa Marta –CGSM- to promote the conservation of biodiversity.

The project components are:

Component 1: Strengthening environmental governance. This component seeks to improve the governance of the CGSM by promoting stakeholder agreements (i.e., local, national, private, and public) that result in an inclusive environmental governance model along with an action plan for its implementation.

Component 2: Protected Areas, Forest Conservation and Restoration. This component aims to provide the technical tools for the management and monitoring of biodiversity in the CGSM, including water use efficiency, forest conservation, and landscape connectivity. The project interventions will support the main activities of the PAs' management plans to protect key habitat and species improving management effectiveness by 15%. The restoration of 110 km of hydrological connections will improve mangrove health. An estimated 1,650 hectares of mangroves will be restored by opening small canals within the mangrove area, in collaboration with local communities, and by dredging of the main wetland canals (with co-financing resources). The second set of activities are oriented to reestablish the water inflows from the Aracataca and Fundación rivers to the CGSM.

Component 3: Sustainable Forest and Land-Use Management. This component aims to increase the area under sustainable production practices by working with the producers in the livestock, oil palm, banana, and coffee, sectors, in the Aracataca and Fundación watersheds.

Component 4: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Communication. This component aims to ensure: (i) measurement of outcomes and impacts; (ii) assessment and systematization of lessons learned, and (iii) Sufficient communication of project findings to stakeholders.