



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

GEF ID:	5288		
Country/Region:	Colombia		
Project Title:	Implementing the Socio-Ecosystem Connectivity Approach to Conserve and Sustainable Use Biodiversity in the Caribbean Region of Colombia		
GEF Agency:	FAO	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:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,052,114
Co-financing:	\$51,067,982	Total Project Cost:	\$57,120,096
PIF Approval:	April 24, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	June 20, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Ivan Leon

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 ?	February 25, 2013 Yes.	January 8, 2015 As at PIF stage.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	February 25, 2013 Yes.	January 8, 2015 As at PIF stage.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	February 25, 2013 Yes.	January 8, 2015 As at PIF stage.
	• the focal area allocation?	February 25, 2013	January 8, 2015

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Yes.	As at PIF stage.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	February 25, 2013 NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	February 25, 2013 NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	February 25, 2013 NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	February 25, 2013 NA.	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	February 25, 2013 Please clarify project's contribution to the Aichi Targets. April 11, 2012 Adequate.	January 8, 2015 Yes.
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	February 25, 2013 Yes.	January 8, 2015 As at PIF stage.
	<p>6. 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>	February 25, 2013 This is a very well-articulated and reasoned proposal.	January 8, 2015 As at PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>February 25, 2013</p> <p>Yes, however, it appears extremely ambitious for a 4-year time frame and with a GEF agency with very little GEF experience in Colombia.</p> <p>Please clarify the justification for the scale and scope of this project which aims to spend \$5 million/year.</p> <p>April 11, 2012</p> <p>Adequate.</p>	<p>January 8, 2015</p> <p>Yes, very clearly presented overall.</p> <p>With regards to Output 3.1.2, we would like further clarity on text in the logframe that discusses land purchasing as part of the strategy for this output (page 133.) We would like a full explanation of what resources are being used for land purchase and how expensive it will be in total. In addition, please explain who will be funding this output with regards to the reforestation element.</p> <p>March 2, 2015</p> <p>Adequate revision and explanation provided: Land purchasing is not part of the strategy for this output, reforestation will be performed in public, private and communal land. Colombian regulations (Act 2811/74) bind land owners to maintain forest coverage of protective forest areas, including buffer riparian areas, within their property. This norm is often disregarded, though. The project will encourage land owners, communities and municipalities to comply with the norm and will support them by providing training and supplies for reforestation.</p> <p>Please note that land purchasing is only mentioned with regard to baseline initiatives: "the Municipality of Chigorodo is finalizing the purchase of 220 has for reforestation purposes" (see</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>baseline column, page 133 Project Document).</p> <p>As regards funding for reforestation, GEF resources will fund training, technical backstopping, seeds and seedling, (see detailed budget for output 3.1.2, Appendix 3, Excel file, Project Document). CVS will also provide seedlings as part of its co-financing.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>February 25, 2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>January 8, 2015</p> <p>Yes, GEBS clearly identified and IC reasoning sound.</p>
	<p>9. 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>January 8, 2015</p> <p>Please clarify why for component three the target for engagement with women is only 20% and 20% for ethnic groups. Is this based on an analysis that indicated that of all producers for the commodities that are the target of the project only 20% are women and only 20% include ethnic groups? Please clarify the rationale for the target selection of participation for these two groups and why the project selected 20% for each.</p> <p>In addition, please note that the gender target in the text is 30% (section 5.1, page 109) while in the project framework it is 20%. Please clarify.</p> <p>March 2, 2015</p> <p>Adequate revision and explanation provided: The selected targets are 30%</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>for engagement with women and 30% for engagement with ethnic groups. Inconsistencies in all the sections of the project document have been corrected (Project Document, pages 75, 80 and 134; CEO Endorsement Request, pages 6 and 34).</p> <p>As regards ethnic groups, the target was selected in order to maintain a balance among the populations settled on the territory. The studies conducted for the full project preparation show that ethnic groups represent the 30% of the total population in the project intervention departments. (See paragraphs and table 1 added in page 9 of the Project Document)</p> <p>As regards gender, Project Component 3 will prioritize the work with female-led households, which represent approximately the 30% of households in the project intervention area. (Data added in page 9 of the Project Document)</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>February 25, 2013</p> <p>Please discuss the participation of civil society and indigenous people more comprehensively.</p> <p>April 11, 2012</p> <p>Adequate.</p>	<p>January 8, 2015</p> <p>As at PIF stage. Explanation of participation of all stakeholders is of sufficient detail and depth.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	February 25, 2013 Yes.	January 8, 2015 Yes full presentation of risks and adequate mitigation plan developed to manage risks.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	February 25, 2013 All relevant activity in the project area is listed and plans for coordination identified. Please ensure that by the time of CEO endorsement robust plans and adequate budget are allocated to ensure coordination takes place.	January 8, 2015 As at PIF stage.
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	February 25, 2013 The concept of socio-ecosystem connectivity and the mosaic approach are innovative means for advancing landscape-level resource use and management that is biodiversity-friendly. Please clarify the project's sustainability strategy and the role of the Regional Corporations in facilitating scaling up results of the project. April 11, 2012 Adequate.	January 8, 2015 Yes, as at PIF stage, with a sustainability plan included in CEO endorsement package.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		January 8, 2015 Very few changes in PIF, mainly restructuring proposed activities and combining some, all expected changes during a design process.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		January 8, 2015 Adequate explanation of the project's cost effectiveness.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	February 25, 2013 Yes.	January 8, 2015 Improved cofinance ratio and considerable cash resources, thus, all funding envelopes are adequate to implement the project.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	February 25, 2013 Agency contribution is minimal at \$30,000. Please clarify why it is so low if the project is a priority for FAO. April 11, 2012 Adequate.	January 8, 2015 FAO contribution is only \$380,000.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	February 25, 2013 Yes.	January 8, 2015 Yes.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	April 11, 2013 PPG request is within norms.	January 8, 2015 PPG activity report provided.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of	February 25, 2013 NA.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	reflows included?		
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>January 8, 2015</p> <p>The BD TT has been submitted.</p> <p>Data for Objective One is satisfactory.</p> <p>Data entered for Objective Two is confusing with regards to the agriculture, fisheries and forestry policies as at project start all of them are achieving almost gold standards already scoring a 5 out of 6 with only monitoring of regulations enforcement to be achieved in the agriculture and fisheries sector. Please clarify these scores and relate them to the logframe targets which do not measure the integration of biodiversity considerations into key sector policies.</p> <p>Therefore, in the logframe and the tracking tools, the project needs to be consistent in presenting what will be measured as progress in achieving the policy change the project aims for as currently the logframe presentation and the tracking tool presentation is not consistent.</p> <p>We also note that in the CEO endorsement request project framework, the outputs note 4 production sectors being the focus, but the tracking tool only lists three (agriculture, forestry and fisheries). Please clarify.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>March 2, 2015</p> <p>BD tracking tools revised and corrected.</p>
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		<p>January 8, 2015</p> <p>Yes.</p>
<p>Agency Responses</p>	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		<p>January 8, 2015</p> <p>Response to STAP review is thorough and adequate however the response on the project time frame is not really an answer and is not adequate. See GEF response under the Council comments.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? • The Council? 		<p>January 8, 2015</p> <p>Response to Council comments are acceptable. The response on the 4-year time frame is an actual answer, unlike that provided to STAP. However, some of these elements are aspects that are expected in every GEF project, for example, a solid baseline to build upon, monitoring to allow for project implementation adjustments in real time, et.c)</p> <p>In addition, there is little evidence that more money available for project implementation will make for faster execution necessarily, and in fact, one could easily see the opposite effect in order to ensure that additional resources are properly used.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Thus, the rationale for the time-frame of implementation, which was noted by GEFSEC, STAP, and the German Council Member, must be better explained.</p> <p>March 3, 2015</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided:</p> <p>FAO and the project proponents have acknowledged the comments made by the STAP, GEFSEC and German council member when the PIF was submitted in 2013.</p> <p>The STAP commented "it is likely doubtful that the proposed outcomes and outputs of component 3 can be effectively achieved within this time period". For this reason, during full project preparation the scope of Component 3 was reformulated to be consistent with the outputs 3.1.3 and 3.1.4. of the PIF, corresponding to a reduction from 200,000 terrestrial hectares and 100,000 marine hectares (see PIF, Table B, outcome 3.1) to 2.429 ha of mosaics of conservation and sustainable use of natural resources have contributed effectively to the socio-ecosystem connectivities in the CRC, plus 3.200 ha under sustainable production plans with existing or new certification schemes (see Table B, CEO Endorsement request, outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.3). These figures are coherent with the original targets presented in the PIF</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>(output 3.1.3: at least 1200 ha with sustainable production plans and output 3.1.4: at least 1000 ha with the SEC approach incorporated in local production schemes)</p> <p>The new project scope is considered to be coherent with and achievable in a 4-years timeframe.</p> <p>Regarding the allocation of funds, GEF funding for Component 3 has been reduced accordingly. Co-financing has increased demonstrating the real interest of departmental governments and Autonomous Regional Corporations (CARs) of the CRC in the Project. The challenge of more money, more delays is already being addressed within the project design. Component 1 will specifically address the inter-institutional coordination among project partners. In addition, project institutional arrangements and governance structure will guarantee participation and voice for all co-financing institutions in the Project Steering Committee (see Section 4.1, page 88 of the Project Document). The AWP/B will be approved yearly by the Project Steering Committee, in coordination with the ongoing co-financing initiatives. Co-financing is expected to be in line with the adjusted timeframe.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
	24. Is PIF clearance/approval	February 25, 2013	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at PIF Stage	being recommended?	No. Please address comments above and resubmit. April 11, 2012 Adequate responses and clarifications and needed changes in the text have been made in the revised PIF. This project is technically cleared and may be included in a future work program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		January 9, 2015 No. Please address all the outstanding issues identified above and resubmit. March 2, 2015 All issues have been addressed and project is recommended for CEO endorsement.
	First review*	February 25, 2013	January 09, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 11, 2013	March 02, 2015
	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.