



First Biennial Transparency Report ?BTRI? and "BTR II/Fourth National Communication?

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11492

Countries

Colombia

Project Name

First Biennial Transparency Report ?BTRI? and "BTR II/Fourth National Communication?

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

1/8/2024

Review completed by PM

1/18/2024

Program Manager

Patricia Marcos Huidobro

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

EA

Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO)

Section I - Enabling Activity Summary

Funding elements.

Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF funding elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF-8 Programming Directions? Is the General Enabling Activity Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

1/17/2024 PM:

Yes (cleared).

Agency's Comments

Cost Ranges.

If there was a deviation in the cost range, was this explained?

Secretariat's Comments

1/17/2024 PM:

Cleared. The project has no deviations in the cost range. The costing is in line with Information Note GEF/C.62/Inf.15 - <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/gef-c-62-inf-15>

Agency's Comments

Enabling activity summary.

Is the enabling activity summary clear? Are the components in Table B and as described in the enabling activity request sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objectives?

Secretariat's Comments

2/7/2024 PM:

- 1) Cleared.** Gender aspects have been further mainstreamed across outputs.
- 2) Cleared.**
- 3) Cleared,** synergies with the on-going CBIT project in Colombia have been included in the CEO Approval document.
- 4) Cleared.**
- 5) Cleared.**

1/17/2024 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- 1) As for gender aspects, the following outputs have relevant gender dimensions. Please incorporate them in Outputs 1.2.1, 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.4.2 and 2.1.1. For Output 1.5.1, please ensure that lessons learned and knowledge generated reflect gender equality dimensions as well.
- 2) Spell DA under Section C "Eligibility Criteria".
- 3) Strengthen the explanation on the coordination and complementarity with the CBIT project in Colombia. Please explain how the proposed project would be built on and benefits from the activities planned under the CBIT.
- 4) UNDP Checklist is missing in the Project Document table.
- 5) It is well noted that the project outlines a preliminary engagement plan. While it mentions civil society as a stakeholder, the project should more clearly elaborate on the important role of CSOs and any specific considerations planned to ensure that CSOs can engage in a consistent manner, such as bringing ground-level vulnerabilities into decision-making processes, providing technical support and research, advocating for action, creating awareness and capacity building.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 2 Feb 2024:

- 1) Gender aspects are included in the indicated outputs: 1.2.1, 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 1.4.2, 2.1.1, 1.5.1.
- 2) DA refers to data analysis. In the EA Request document, Section C "Eligibility Criteria", the acronym is removed, and the words are left complete to avoid confusion.
- 3) In the "Eligibility Criteria" section, we delve into the complementarity between both projects and extended information on how the 1BTR, 4NC+2BTR project directly benefits from the CBIT project.
- 4) UNDP Checklist has been uploaded into GEF portal documents.
- 5) Due to the number of words established in the format of the document in this section the role of the actors involved in the project was presented in an executive manner. Based on the comment, we extended the information in EA request and UNDP project document. It details more precisely the important role of CSOs and the specific considerations provided to guarantee their participation and how their contributions will be incorporated into the analysis of territorial information due to the impacts of climate change.

Section 2 - Enabling Activity Supporting Information

Eligibility Criteria.

Is this enabling activity eligible for GEF funding?

Secretariat's Comments

1/17/2024 PM:

Yes (cleared).

Agency's Comments

Institutional framework.

Are the institutional arrangements for implementation adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

2/9/2024 PM:

Cleared. "Implementing Partner" has been replaced by "Executing Agency".

2/7/2024 PM:

Cleared, with comments. Thank you for clarifying that Fundacion Natura is the only executing agency of the project. Kindly note that "Implementing Partner" is a UNDP terminology. To avoid misunderstanding among the GEF stakeholders and harmonize the terms with other GEF projects, grateful if you can please replace "Implementing Partner" by "Executing Agency" across the CEO Approval document.

1/17/2024 PM:

No. In the stakeholder section, both IDEMA and MinAmbiente have been identified as executing entities for the project. Please clarify whether these two entities would also be executing GEF resources. If yes, they shall be added as Project Executing Entities under Table "Section 1: Enabling Activity Summary" and the responsible entity under the budget table updated accordingly. If not, please amend the stakeholder section to clarify these two entities will both be focal points for the project, but they will not be executing entities as defined by the GEF.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 2 Feb 2024:

The execution of GEF resources is the responsibility of the implementing partner, that is NGO Fundaci?n Natura. In the EA_Request document, Section 1: Summary of the Enabling Activity" it is specified that both IDEAM and MinAmbiente will be project focal point but will not be execution entities according to the definition of the GEF. This is also evident in section D Institutional Framework.

UNDP response, 9 Feb 2024:

The term "Implementing Partner" was replaced by term "Executing Agency" in the CEO approval document.

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat's Comments

1/17/2024 PM:

Yes (cleared).

Agency's Comments

Section 3. Information Tables

GEF resource availability.

Is the proposed GEF financing in Table F (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1/17/2024 PM:

Yes (cleared).

Agency Response

Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

1/17/2024 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

1/17/2024 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

1/17/2024 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat's Comments
1/17/2024 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments
1/17/2024 PM:

Yes (cleared). This is in line with the information note GEF/C.62/Inf.15.

Agency's Comments
Rio Markers.
Are the Rio Markers for CCM ,CCA, BD and LD presented?

Secretariat's Comments
1/17/2024 PM:

Yes (cleared).

Agency's Comments
Country endorsement.

Has the project been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point at the time of the EA submission and has the name and position been checked against the GEF database? Are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in Portal

Secretariat's Comments
2/7/2024 PM:

Cleared. The project title has been updated in the GEF Portal, and it now matches the title in the LoE.

1/17/2024 PM:

No. The project has been endorsed by the Country's GEF Operational Focal Point, Mrs. Maria Teresa Becerra, and the endorsed amounts are consistent with the amounts included in the Portal. However, the title in the Portal, i.e., "Fourth National Communication, First and Second Biennial Transparency Report (1BTR, 4NC+2BTR)", doesn't match the EA title as per the LoE, i.e., "First Biennial Transparency Report BTR I and BTR II/Fourth National Communication". Please consider updating the title in either the LoE or the Portal so they both match.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 2 Feb 2024:

The project title has been adjusted and is the same now in all documents, as well as in the GEF portal.

Response to Comments

Are all the comments adequately responded to? (only as applicable)

Gef Secretariat comments

Secretariat's Comments

1/17/2024 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat's Comments

1/17/2024 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments

Council comments

Secretariat's Comments

1/17/2024 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
STAP comments

Secretariat's Comments
1/17/2024 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat's Comments
1/17/2024 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
CSOs comments

Secretariat's Comments
1/17/2024 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
Project Budget Table.

Is the project budget table attached? Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

Secretariat's Comments
2/7/2024 PM:

Cleared. PMC amounts have been updated and harmonized across the document.

1/17/2024 PM:

No. Please note there is a mismatch in the PMC amounts between the Budget Table, i.e. US\$100,600 and the Project Components US\$103,600. Please clarify the correct amount and amend the budget table/project components accordingly.

Agency's Comments

UNDP response, 2 Feb 2024:

The typo in PMC amount in the GEF budget has been corrected.

Environmental and Social Safeguards.

**If there are screening documents or other ESS documents available, have these been attached?
(only as applicable)**

Secretariat's Comments

1/17/2024 PM:

Yes (cleared).

Agency's Comments

**GEFSEC DECISION
RECOMMENDATION.**

Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?

Secretariat's Comments

2/9/2024 PM:

Yes (cleared).

2/7/2024 PM:

No, with a minor suggestion. Please see minor comment above in section "Institutional Framework". The comment suggest replacing "Implementing Partner" by "Executing Agency", the later been a specific GEF term. This would help avoid misunderstandings within our stakeholders.

1/17/2024 PM:

No. Please address comments identified above. Also, as mentioned above, please upload UNDP checklist.

REVIEW DATE(S)

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat comments**

First Review
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)