



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

GEF ID:	4916		
Country/Region:	Colombia		
Project Title:	Conservation of biodiversity in landscapes impacted by mining in the Choco Biogeographic Region		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5035 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,850,000
Co-financing:	\$40,237,393	Total Project Cost:	\$46,087,393
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Santiago Carrizosa

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 29, 2012 Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	March 29, 2012 Yes in a letter dated March 22, 2012.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	March 29, 2012 Strengthen this section with more specific text germane to the mining sector in Colombia, UNDP's expertise in working with extractive industries globally and in Colombia, and the focus of the Country Office in the Choco, vis a vis mining and environmental policy	

*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>making.</p> <p>April 2, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?</p>	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<p>5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?</p>	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>UNDP GEF has a large portfolio of projects in Colombia in various stages of development and implementation. Please clarify how UNDP is managing this growing portfolio from a staffing perspective that ensures appropriate oversight.</p> <p>April 2, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided. Please note our interest is in the number of staff in-country that are overseeing the implementation of the portfolio.</p>	
Resource Availability	<p>6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>March 29, 2012</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"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>NA</p>	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Under output 2, BD-2 please provide a number for the number of and-use plans that incorporate BD and ecosystem services valuation.</p> <p>April 2, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</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>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Yes, very clearly.</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Yes, with focus on monitoring and enforcement of the new policies and instruments to regulate the mining industry.</p>	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address,	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Please clarify what elements of the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>baseline \$50 million are necessary for the cofinancing (totalling \$40 million) of the GEF project.</p> <p>April 2, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Yes for component one, there is clear incrementality with the modest GEF investment to ensure the new mining code incorporates biodiversity considerations. The second component is more of a classic GEF investment to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and the incrementality is well-argued.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Please clarify the number of protected areas that the project will work in under Component Two. It notes that 5 PAs will protect 250,000 hectares and then that only 3 PAs will be measured for improved management effectiveness.</p> <p>Please note that 20% increase in METT, maybe a good result or a very poor result depending on the baseline score. Please either commit to an actual METT</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>score or defer committing to a METT target score until the CEO endorsement phase as you will have a baseline METT score at that time and can identify a more realistic target.</p> <p>Please ensure that by the time of CEO endorsement, the various outcomes in Component Two dealing with biodiversity status/condition including the areas currently undergoing fragmentation have appropriate biological indicators or threat reduction indicators in the logframe.</p> <p>April 2, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Yes, this is clearly presented and logical.</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/additional benefits?</p>	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>This is likely the most challenging element of the project under component two and it is clearly described.</p> <p>Please ensure that by the time of CEO endorsement that appropriate market analysis and studies are done to ensure the economic viability of the various strategies proposed: NTFPs, bush meat, etc and that appropriate monitoring and enforcement measures are in place to ensure sustainable off-take.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		UNDP gender marker to be employed.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Please expand upon how indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities will be involved and engaged in the project.</p> <p>April 2, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Yes, adequate and realistic presentation of risks and ratings and mitigation strategies.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Yes, coordination plan is adequate.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Yes, adequate for the PIF stage.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Yes and within costs norms.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Yes the amount of resources is more than adequate to achieve what is being proposed.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Given the extensive baseline investment and the importance of the mining industry in the region, please clarify why no mining companies are listed in the cofinance table.</p> <p>For the contributions of the NGOs, please include one line for each WWF and MacArthur and a dollar amount for each. Please note that CEPF cannot be used as cofinance if the MacArthur contribution is related to the CEPF activity mentioned elsewhere in the document.</p> <p>Please confirm that USAID is aware that their potential contribution of \$2.15 million has been listed in the PIF as cofinance.</p> <p>April 2, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>A very large amount of cash cofinance from UNDP CO is suggested of \$1.3 million.</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Not at this time. Please address the issues noted above and resubmit a revised PIF.</p> <p>April 2, 2012</p> <p>Yes, as all revisions and clarifications are satisfactory.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 29, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 02, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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. 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*	
	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.