



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4849		
Country/Region:	Colombia		
Project Title:	Sustainable Management and Conservation of Biodiversity in the Magdalena River Basin		
GEF Agency:	IADB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2; BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$180,000	Project Grant:	\$6,363,600
Co-financing:	\$25,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$31,543,600
PIF Approval:	February 21, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 12, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Fernando Balcazar

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	March 21, 2012 Yes.	April 4, 2016 As at PIF stage.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	March 21, 2012 Yes in a letter dated March 1, 2012.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	March 21, 2012 No. Please provide within the text of the PIF and in the budget for the PIF, the expected cofinance from the project CO-L1105 and describe how the GEF project will complement this \$60 million loan in order that global environmental benefits are generated	April 4, 2016 As at PIF stage.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>from the blended operation. The project design and project budget as currently presented is a stand-alone GEF operation which undermines the rationale for the involvement of IADB.</p> <p>May 3, 2012</p> <p>Based on the explanation provided for allocating 5\$ million of the \$60 million loan and the remaining elements of the PIF, we are recommending that IADB delay submission of a revised PIF until the details and geographic focus of the loan both at site level and basin-level are clearly established as only at that time will the project be refined enough to identify the actual elements of the loan that the GEF project can build upon, thus solidifying the Agency's comparative advantage for the PIF as well.</p> <p>September 25, 2012</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided.</p>	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>NA</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>NA.</p>
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Please describe IADB's technical staff in the country office that will manage and supervise the project.</p> <p>May 3, 2012</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Adequate response.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Colombia has sufficient resources in it BD allocation to support the project.</p> <p>We note that the project focal area strategy framework identifies LD-1, however, no GEF resources are being requested from the LD focal area. Comments on this from a design perspective are presented below.</p> <p>Please do not include LD-1 in the FA strategy framework if LD resources are not being requested.</p> <p>September 25, 2012</p> <p>No LD resources are being requested.</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>
	• the focal area allocation?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Yes for biodiversity.</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>NA.</p>
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>NA.</p>
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>NA.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>NA.</p>
Project Consistency	<p>7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?</p>	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Please note that in Table A, the FA outcomes and outputs should not altered other than to specify ecosystem types, include numbers, etc. The substantive text should remain and not be changed.</p> <p>As noted above, if LD-1 is included in Table A, resources from the focal area from GEF need to be allocated there, otherwise please delete the row entirely.</p> <p>With regards to the BD-1 outcome and outputs, please note that this is inconsistent with the text and the project framework. The document presents a confusing description of this element of the project as in some places the project appears to be only developing plans for the 20 protected areas and in other parts of the document, it appears that the project is also going to implement management activities within these protected areas. Please clarify this throughout the document and be consistent. Once we have a consistent presentation of this element of the the project we will provide a full analysis of this component.</p> <p>May 3, 2012</p> <p>As noted above in the previous</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>comment "Please note that in Table A, the FA outcomes and outputs should not altered other than to specify ecosystem types, include numbers, etc". Therefore please correct Table A to include the number of PAs, the hectares, the number of policies and regulatory frameworks, the number of national and sub-national land-use plans that will incorporate ecosystem services valuation and biodiversity, the hectares of certified landscapes.</p> <p>September 25, 2012</p> <p>The project is now properly aligned.</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>The relevant objectives for BD are identified. For LD, they are also identified, but if no GEF resources are being committed to the SLM elements of the project, please delete this part of Table A and in the associated text.</p> <p>September 25, 2012</p> <p>Adequate.</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Yes, for the most part.</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the</p>	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Actually, the way the project</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>A change in the lead executing agency</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>implementation is constructed with TNC as the executing agency of the project seems to undermine sustainability of project outcomes. Given the technical capacity of the Government agencies within Colombia to play the role of the lead executing agency, the strength of the Humboldt Institute, and the CARs we do not understand why TNC is playing such a pivotal role in the project's execution. It would seem that TNC should be playing a technical advisory role, and that local and national agencies responsible for the management of the river basin, including the targeted watersheds, should be spearheading this process to ensure sustainability of project outcomes. Please clarify.</p> <p>May 3, 2012</p> <p>The response from IADB seeks to justify the choice of an international NGO to supervise the implementation of a project that will be involved in promoting changes in land-use and management of public and private lands. However, this explanation is not sufficient as the PIF does not articulate how, given this chosen project execution arrangement, how the sustainability of project outcomes will be achieved. Please revise PIF accordingly.</p> <p>September 27, 2012</p>	<p>has altered TNC's role to a supporting technical role which seems appropriate with the national NGO, Fundacion Natura, taking the lead executing agency role.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>An adequate and comprehensive explanation is provided on why TNC is playing such a lead role in the project and the role of key government organizations and the CARs and how their enhanced capacity may contribute to sustaining the outputs and outcomes of the project.</p>	
Project Design	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>No. Please describe the IADB loan CO - L1105 as well as other investments of the Government of Colombia in the river basin that the GEF increment will complement.</p> <p>The Magdalena River Basin is enormous (27 million hectares), but the PIF does not state where in the entire river basin the project will work and it appears that some activities are for the entire basin and others are very targeted. This requires clarification and then the baseline has to be described for each of these geographic areas as well as the thematic issues that will be addressed in each geography. Please clarify.</p> <p>Please identify the location of the project sites and areas where on the ground interventions will take place as it appears the project proposes (and the document is inconsistent in this regard) PA management covering 144,000 hectares, one fisheries management plan, watershed management plans (is</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>There have been changes since the PIF which has narrowed the focus within the Basin and in terms of the breadth of the project, and these appear to be reasonable changes, as such the presentation of the baseline project, and how the GEF investment complements it have changed. These all appear to be reasonable and justified, particularly given the fact the design process since work program approval has taken three years.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>this for the entire basin?) and numerous other enabling activities that may or may not cover the entire basin.</p> <p>May 3, 2012</p> <p>This section is still inadequate as it remains too generic and none of the issues raised previously have been satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>September 25, 2012</p> <p>The problem analysis is clearer and sufficiently described, however, it is unclear if the baseline projects and their financing is also being presented as project cofinance. Projects under implementation that will continue regardless of whether the GEF project is implemented would be properly accounted as the project baseline which the GEF project would complement as part of the increment. Please clarify.</p> <p>December 10, 2012</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>The presentation of cost effectiveness is inadequate.</p> <p>Please expand upon this explanation.</p> <p>For example, the project's total cost is more than \$30 million and the coverage</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>in terms of hectares is very small. How can this approach be considered cost-effective?</p> <p>It also not clear why the CEO endorsement request references an investment that cost \$10 million without comparing the approach of the \$30 million GEF project and the \$10 million project in Mojana. Please revise this section and present a more robust discussion.</p> <p>The text refers to the work on conservation mosaics covering 500,000 hectares but this does not show up in the results frameworks of the project, nor are the condition and quality of these hectares monitored for biodiversity condition during the project. Please clarify this within the context of a discussion of the cost-effectiveness of the investment.</p> <p>June 30, 2016</p> <p>Adequate clarification provided.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>This entire section of the PIF is inadequate.</p> <p>The project as described--and this is exclusive of the IADB \$60 million loan--entails an investment of \$30 million to (see project description on page 10) to develop 20 PA management plans</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>covering only 140,000 hectares, developing more plans, guidelines and tools for watershed management with very little direct action to counter the drivers of biodiversity loss and land degradation. Hence, this project as presented is very expensive on both a per/hectare basis and on an output/outcome per dollar basis.</p> <p>There is little demonstration of the incremental nature of the GEF activities and investment as the entirety of components one and two are actually focused on the development of plans, studies and guidelines with no implementation indicated nor threat mitigation that would result in the generation of global benefits. Please revise and or clarify the project intervention logic and the incremental reasoning behind the GEF investment.</p> <p>May 3, 2012</p> <p>This section is still inadequate as it remains too generic in terms of the geography of the intervention. Once the IADB loan is clarified, and once the actual sites for the IADB loan as well as other baseline investments are identified and basin-wide activities defined, then please revise this section to be much more specific and focused as that is the only way the GEF increment and the GEF complement to the IADB loan and the baseline investments can be</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>explained, justified and presented.</p> <p>September 25, 2012</p> <p>Yes activities defined for GEF support are adequately based on incremental reasoning, however, what is not entirely clear is how the baseline (as noted above in question 11) is being characterized and accounted for in terms of the its substantive content upon which the project builds and the financing that these investments bring to the project. Please clarify.</p> <p>December 10, 2012</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>The problem description for the basin (see pages 6-8) is not matched by a clear and explicit corresponding set of responses in the project design and project framework that addresses these drivers of biodiversity loss and land degradation.</p> <p>We note with particular concern the following issues that are identified in the problem statement, but for which no clear and comprehensive response is provided for in the project components:</p> <p>1) changes in land-use along the river including conversion of forests to agriculture and excessive use of</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>No. The project has been under design phase for at least three years, and included the participation of leading technical and scientific agencies, yet there is not one measure of biodiversity condition in the project results framework. Please revise the framework to include such outcomes and indicators.</p> <p>In addition, it is quite concerning that the species that will be a measure of outcome four has not even been selected but only tentatively identified. Please identify the species that will be the outcome measure and present its baseline status in a revised submission.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>chemicals; 2) demands on water for industrial use, irrigation, livestock, tourism; 3) Siltation and dams; 4) various actions by ranchers;</p> <p>From the land degradation focal area perspective, it would seem prudent to have targeted investments in SLM beyond just unspecified incentives to land users. We encourage the project proponents to consider allocating LD resources under LD3. This can then focus on targeted improvements in production practices across the watershed as a means of reduce siltation and pollution in the freshwater bodies. Potential improvements can be included as part of the watershed planning process where farmers (or land users) can be given the opportunity to explore SLM options for the farms. These direct investments can then be matched with incentives proposed under the current component 2.</p> <p>May 3, 2012</p> <p>This section, as noted previously, is still too generic as there are no specific sites identified. In addition, the description of the watershed management activities do not seem to justify hardly any GEF investment given the nature of the activities.</p> <p>As noted above, we recommend that</p>	<p>Many of the GEF CEO Endorsement outcomes are not outcomes but outputs. The declaration of a protected area is an output. What we want to measure as an outcome is the biological condition of these protected areas and we want it to either improve or at the very least stay the same. The METT is only a proxy, and as is normal practice in GEF protected area projects, project proponents measure biodiversity condition as well to complement the METT. The METT is not a substitute for biological monitoring. Please revise all the project results frameworks accordingly.</p> <p>What will be the total coverage of protected areas managed under component one, both new (5) and existing (4)? Please include. For each of these areas, the project needs to have an outcome indicator of the biological condition of the area. During the three-year design process, these indicators should have been identified and baselines established upon which progress would be measured.</p> <p>In sum, the Results Frameworks need revised and refined as noted above, with special attention paid to differentiating between outputs and outcomes, ensuring that total coverage in hectares of the intervention is consistently presented (new and existing protected areas,</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>IADB wait till the hard loan is more adequately developed and when the physical sites for all the site based activity are identified as part of the IADB loan and the other baseline investemnts, both in terms of the PA management investment and the watershed management investment and at the basin level. Only at that time, can a proper design be developed that takes into account the global biodiversity significance of the sites which is necessary to calculate the GEF increment based on incremental reasoning.</p> <p>September 25, 2012</p> <p>Please clarify the following elements of the project framework as there appears to be some inconsistency in the text and the project framework:</p> <p>1) Will the 15 PA management plans be implemented? The text indicates that the management plans will be implemented, however, in the project framework the only outcome is the declaration of the PAs but not the improved management of the protected areas. Please clarify this under outcome one under project component one.</p> <p>2) Will the modified (for biodiversity) ten watershed management plans be implemented and if so, what will be the biodiversity outcome measure under</p>	<p>conservation mosaic landscapes) and that the biodiversity measures are also included that the project will monitor for these areas. Finally, with regards to the one fish species measured per outcome four, the project has to commit to what that species will be and provide the baseline figures for it.</p> <p>June 30, 2016</p> <p>The project framework still confuses outputs with outcomes. For a project that took so many years to design, the project framework and logframe remains limited and weak overall. Given the long design phase and the failure to respond to the first review in a significant way, we do not expect any significant improvement at this time therefore no further comment will be provided.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Component Two?</p> <p>3) Under component two, please specify what biodiversity habitats and populations will be enhanced. Also, ensure that by the time of CEO endorsement that the measure for "biodiversity habitats and populations enhanced", is the actual status of a component of a biodiversity and a measure (density, number, etc) of globally significant populations.</p> <p>4) In the project framework please include the hectare coverage under outputs for the 15 PA management plans and the 10 watershed management plans.</p> <p>5) Please clarify in output 2.1 what is the certification process being employed for the 50,000 hectares under management by the 2,000 land users and how this certification scheme is biodiversity positive or friendly.</p> <p>December 10, 2012</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided. Please ensure that data gaps are entirely filled by the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>The description of the additional benefits is too generic. Given the richness of aquatic and terrestrial biodiversity, the extensive research</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>Once the project framework is revised as noted above, please revise this section.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>work done by TNC, and the fact that the project will target 20 high priority areas for BD conservation, we would expect a more robust description of the incremental benefits that would be delivered by this project. Please improve.</p> <p>May 3, 2012</p> <p>This remains inadequate in the PIF and needs totally revised as noted above. The current design does not justify the GEF investment. For example, for component one the cost per hectare is 42\$ which is very expensive for the region. Please note that we would expect that the globally significant sites that overlap with the baseline investments would be known at the PIF stage as only in that way can an assessment be done on the incremental benefits that the GEF investment would provide. This holds true for component two as well.</p> <p>September 25, 2012</p> <p>Adequate presentation of the global biodiversity benefits generated by the project.</p>	<p>June 30, 2016</p> <p>Given the limitations noted above, the explanation and clarifications provided are adequate.</p>
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/</p>	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Please revise this section and include gender dimensions in the revision.</p> <p>May 3, 2012</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>This section is at the level of detail and sophistication expected at the concept stage. After a lengthy design process, we expect a much more robust</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	additional benefits?	Adequate revision provided.	<p>description of socio-economic benefits with actual data based on the design process that assessed fisheries potential for providing socio economic benefits to local communities. Please revise accordingly.</p> <p>June 30, 2016</p> <p>A moderate improvement that is adequate.</p>
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Please include in your presentation, the role of CSOs and indigenous people and how their participation and that of fishing and farming communities is taken into consideration and addressed.</p> <p>May 3, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>No. Please expand upon this section with much greater details on the stakeholder participation plan and particularly in the implementation of conservation mosaics which requires very intensive stakeholder engagement, as evidenced by other GEF projects that have supported this kind of approach.</p> <p>June 30, 2016</p> <p>This section remains inadequate. The project design requires considerable stakeholder engagement yet the document still does not provide any details. Please revise.</p> <p>July 27, 2016</p> <p>Adequate.</p>
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Please discuss how the project proposes to account for climate change</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>No. Please expand upon this section and in particular how the project factors</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>consequences and ensuring the climate resilience of the proposed watershed management and fishing management plans. In addition, as regards the declaration of the new PAs and their management, please also discuss climate change considerations and the risk mitigation measures that will be implemented.</p> <p>May 3, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	<p>in climate change, with the identification and siting of the new protected areas, for example.</p> <p>June 30, 2016</p> <p>Adequate.</p>
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>As noted above, please discuss the relationship of the GEF project with the IADB \$60 million loan.</p> <p>May 3, 2102</p> <p>Based on the overall generic nature of the PIF, we are recommending that IADB wait till the loan is further advanced in terms of its content and where the loan will invest so that the coordination of the GEF investment and that of other cofinanciers can be more clearly articulated.</p> <p>September 25, 2012</p> <p>The PIF provides a list of GEF projects and notes how they will complement and are consistent with the proposed project, however, very little detail is provided on structured coordination to</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>The endorsement request does not provide sufficient details on how coordination with existing and relevant projects, both GEF and other donors, will be realized. Please provide more details.</p> <p>June 30, 2016</p> <p>Simply listing projects and stating that "we will coordinate" is not sufficient at CEO endorsement. Please provide details on the coordination mechanisms and activities and how coordination will be financially supported.</p> <p>July 27, 2016</p> <p>Adequate.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>ensure that coordination with these projects will add value to the goal of the proposed project: sustainable management of the biodiversity in the Magdalena River Basin. Please clarify if the other donor and GEF projects in the Basin are sufficiently relevant, both thematically and geographically, to the proposed project and how the proposed project will coordinate with them to ensure that any potential synergies between these various investments are realized. Simply providing a list of projects with brief descriptions is not adequate.</p> <p>December 10, 2012</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Please refer to comments under question 10 above and explain the rationale for the project implementation arrangement.</p> <p>May 3, 2102</p> <p>The explanation and revision is inadequate and a fuller description of implementation arrangements should be articulated once the design is more refined.</p> <p>September 25, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>It is not possible to assess. Please provide a schematic and fuller explanation that outlines the project implementation and execution arrangements.</p> <p>June 30, 2016</p> <p>Adequate but presented at a minimum level of information.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>Yes, the structure remains true to the spirit of the original PIF, but the project design has indeed changed during the three years since the PIF was approved in the GEF work program. However, insufficient details have been provided with regards to the substance of the project, as has been noted in this review, which make a full assessment on the benefit of these changes difficult with the current documentation. Once a revised CEO endorsement is presented, the review will revisit this issue once again.</p> <p>June 30, 2016</p> <p>Adequate clarification provided.</p>
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>NA.</p>
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Yes and within cost norms.</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>March 20, 2012</p> <p>Given the amount of GEF funding and cofinance, the expected outcomes and outputs seem very modest in nature. Thus, the financing seems more than adequate to achieve these outcomes and outputs.</p> <p>September 25, 2012</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>It is too hard to tell, as the cofinancing information is not always clear nor is the presentation of the cofinancing in Table C clear either. Once this is clarified, the review will reassess this issue.</p> <p>June 30, 2016</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Please refer to the comments under the project framework seeking clarity on outcomes that will be achieved through this large project (>\$30 million) and the intent of the project to implement various management plans (protected areas and watershed) and their hectare coverage.</p> <p>December 10, 2012</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided.</p>	<p>Adequate.</p>
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>The cofinancing package is robust even when not including the \$60 million loan of IADB that the project might complement, however, it almost seems excessive when compared to the outcomes and outputs that the project will deliver. This aspect of the PIF will be reviewed again once the revised PIF is presented.</p> <p>May 3, 2012</p> <p>It still remains unclear where the loan will be active and what activities will be funded by the IADB loan and other donors.</p> <p>September 25, 2012</p> <p>Although disappointing that the IADB is no longer offering any cofinancing, the Government cofinance is robust and</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>Please clarify the cofinancing amounts provided in Table C as either cash OR in-kind, not both, for each individual cofinancier.</p> <p>We note that the amount from the adaptation fund has been adjusted downward by 50%. Please clarify then, why all the other cofinancing letter amounts are also not adjusted downwards?</p> <p>Second, please clarify how this adjustment impacts the achievement of the project outcomes. That is, was the project designed in terms of costs per outcome at the time of the cofinancing letters (most were dated 6 months ago) and then reduced by 50% overall or just for the money from the adaptation fund? Please clarify all of this.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>much of it is cash. However, please clarify if these are investments that are under implementation or are these projects that will be implemented at the start of the GEF project as this impacts their categorization as baseline or cofinance.</p> <p>Furthermore, please clarify if TNC will be providing any cofinance. As one of the international environmental NGOs that has the largest annual budget of any international NGO in the world, we would expect TNC to be providing cofinance to the project.</p> <p>December 10, 2012</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided.</p>	<p>June 30, 2016</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided.</p>
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>Please clarify the role of IADB's loan CO-L1105 and its relation to the project.</p> <p>As currently presented in the PIF, IADB is not providing any cofinance.</p> <p>May 3, 2012</p> <p>IADB is proposing to provide \$5 million out of a \$60 million loan that is still under discussion.</p> <p>September 25, 2012</p> <p>No cofinancing is being provided by IADB. Please clarify the amount of</p>	<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>Please clarify IADB's financing role, if any in the current design.</p> <p>June 30, 2016</p> <p>IADB provides no cofinancing to this project.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>parallel financing IADB is claiming to contribute to the project out of the \$60 million loan.</p> <p>December 10, 2012</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided.</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>June 30, 2016</p> <p>With the revised submission, we did not see the tracking tool for BD-2 projects. Given that most of the GEF grant is being spent on BD-2, the project must submit a BD-2 tracking tool.</p> <p>July 27, 2016</p> <p>Without a BD-2 Tracking Tool appropriately filled out the project will not be recommended for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>July 28, 2016</p> <p>The BD-2 tracking tool has not been completed appropriately.</p> <p>The results framework for the project had identified an outcome of mainstreaming biodiversity into 500,000 hectares through the implementation of legal instruments that govern land use. This has to be reflected in the BD-2</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>tracking tool correctly.</p> <p>In addition, the project will recover critical riparian and watershed habitats for at least 300 hectares. This also should be reflected in the BD-2 tracking tool.</p> <p>We encourage the project proponents to take the time to complete the tracking tool correctly.</p> <p>October 3, 2016</p> <p>Please see comment above, as the tool still has not been completed properly.</p> <p>October 6, 2016</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	<p>28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>Please clarify the table on pages 13-14. First, does the project propose to pay somebody \$100,800 simply to coordinate M&E or this project coordinator's salary being paid out of the M&E component. Please clarify.</p> <p>Please note that the cost of \$60,000 to complete tracking tools is excessive and should be eliminated. The mid-term and final evaluation covers the cost of completing the tracking tools which should be part of the TOR of the evaluator. Please revise accordingly.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>June 30, 2016</p> <p>Adequate.</p>
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>NA.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>NA.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>Please clarify how the project has addressed the comments from Germany:</p> <p>"Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The German Government (BMZ) through the German International Cooperation Agency (GIZ) provides support to Colombia through the implementation of the bilateral project PROMAC (Environmental Policy and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources). Within the efforts of donor coordination it is requested that the final project document specifies ways of collaboration/ coordination." <p>June 30, 2016</p> <p>Please clarify how often the roundtable meets and then how the GEF project</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>proposes, in a concrete and detailed way, to liaise with the GIZ-funded project.</p> <p>July 27, 2016</p> <p>Adequate.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		<p>April 4, 2016</p> <p>NA.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</p>	<p>March 21, 2012</p> <p>No. Many issues have been raised in the review sheet. Please revise the PIF and resubmit.</p> <p>May 3, 2012</p> <p>No. Many issues have been identified. Prior to resubmission, please wait till the IADB loan is well advanced so the PIF can be designed to complement this investment and that of the other baseline funding in a way that is consistent with IADB's comparative advantage and the GEF mandate to generate global environmental benefits. Overall, the PIF is very generic and requires more substantive detail and content. Please revise the PIF substantially focusing on the specific nature of the project investments including the identification of the sites (both PAs and watersheds) so that the GEF global environmental benefits can be clearly discussed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Please also note the following errors which require correction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Separate budget amounts are required for outcomes 2.1 and 2.2. 2. In the focal area strategy framework the grant amount is \$6,363,000 and within the project framework the grant amount is \$6,363,636. 3. Project management cost in the focal area strategy framework is \$315,000, but \$310,000 in project framework. <p>September 25, 2012</p> <p>The current version of the PIF is a considerable improvement over previous versions, however, some key issues still require resolution as referenced above in this review. Please address them and resubmit.</p> <p>December 10, 2012</p> <p>Yes, all outstanding issues have been adequately addressed. This PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming work program.</p> <p>February 11, 2013</p> <p>A revised PIF was submitted with a corrected fee request and the PIF is recommended for CEO clearance. The project has been cleared for the April 2013 Work Program.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	December 10, 2012 Please see above for issues to be addressed by the time of CEO endorsement.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		April 4, 2016 Yes.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		April 4, 2016 No. The CEO endorsement package is inadequate as detailed above. Please address all issues above in a comprehensive manner and resubmit. June 30, 2016 The revised submission addressed some of the issues in a minimally adequate fashion. However, some further issues remain unresolved. Please address all remaining issues and resubmit. July 27, 2016 No. The project has to submit the tracking tool noted in question 27 above. Please complete and resubmit. July 28, 2016

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>No. The project has to submit the BD-2 tracking tool correctly as noted in question 27 above. Please complete and resubmit.</p> <p>October 3, 2016</p> <p>No. The tracking tool for BD-2 has not completed properly. Please arrange a teleconference with Fundacion Natura so that GEFSEC can review the tool with them and inform them what is missing.</p> <p>October 6, 2016</p> <p>Yes, cleared.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 21, 2012	April 04, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 03, 2012	June 30, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 25, 2012	July 28, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 10, 2012	October 03, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 11, 2013	October 06, 2016

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	

	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 11, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.