



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

GEF ID:	<b>5680</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Colombia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Consolidation of the National System of Protected Areas(SINAP) at National and Regional Levels.</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>IADB</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$135,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$4,157,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$15,651,515</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$20,078,515</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>April 01, 2014</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>May 27, 2014</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Mark Zimsky</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Fernnando Balcazar</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	January 27, 2014 Yes.	July 6, 2016 Yes.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	January 27, 2014  Yes but please provide a letter with an actual date.  March 23, 2014  Resolved.	July 6, 2016  Yes.
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.  
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	January 27, 2014 Yes.	July 6, 2016 Yes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	January 27, 2014 Yes.	July 6, 2016 Yes.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	January 27, 2014 NA.	July 6, 2016 NA.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	January 27, 2014 NA.	July 6, 2016 NA.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	January 27, 2014 NA.	July 6, 2016 NA.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	January 27, 2014 NA.	July 6, 2016 NA.
<b>Strategic Alignment</b>	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>? <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>	<p>January 27, 2014</p> <p>The project has two main aims: to improve management effectiveness and also financial sustainability. In addition, the project aims to increase coverage of the PA system.</p> <p>The outcomes and outputs in Table B need to be more precise and the text in the PIF must complement the outputs and outcomes. The table must include:</p> <p>1) the number of protected areas and coverage in hectares and the protected area's individual names where the project will seek an improvement in management effectiveness. Please clarify if the</p>	<p>July 6, 2016</p> <p>Adequate responses to comments made at CEO endorsement, however, the hectare coverage is not clear.</p> <p>In the CEO endorsement request, the outcome under component three is 550,000 hectares of new protected areas. However, on page 5 of the CEO endorsement request, under A.4 and tables i) and ii) the area of new protected areas to be supported by the project is about 775,000 hectares. Please clarify.</p> <p>Furthermore, on page 3 of the "Technical Support Document", on page 3 under Component Three the area listed</p>

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>assumption of the project is that an updated management plan will result in improved management effectiveness. The literature indicates that this actually is not a causal relationship, hence a more sophisticated presentation of the problem statement vis a vis the particular sites where the project will work is required.</p> <p>2)the number of new protected areas that will be created and their hectare coverage. The text of the PIF should also identify what ecosystem gaps are being filled with this expansion and how this contributes to PA system sustainability.</p> <p>3) the financial sustainability target for SINAP: what revenues will be generated and what gap with this fill (percentage reduction or actual dollar value). This should be explained more comprehensively in the text as well in light of all the GEF and other donor investments being undertaken to achieve this already and a rationale provided as to why it is a worthwhile investment under this project to attempt to do this. The PIF is not convincing on this point.</p> <p>4) the number of protected area plans that will be updated and their hectare coverage and the names of each of these protected areas. In the text of the document, the PIF must provide a rationale as to why updating management plans for these protected areas is critical to address threats to biodiversity.</p>	<p>is only 193,000 hectares. Please clarify.</p> <p>August 23, 2016</p> <p>The hectare coverage remains unclear even though the footnote explaining the 25% reduction is helpful. For example, the numbers presented in the tables in A4 do not match the numbers in Annex E.</p> <p>October 3, 2016</p> <p>Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>5) Please clarify in the text of the document, what is the GEF being requested to pay for, that is, the increment, with regards to output 1.4. Please then also explain how this is critical to improving PA management effectiveness and addressing threats to the targeted protected areas of the project.</p> <p>As is evident from the comments above, the PIF provides minimal substantive information on the condition of the PA system, existing gaps, climate change risks for specific protected areas in specific ecosystems (for example, while it is clear that this is an issue for the Andes, we doubt it is for the Pacific), and a clear rationale for the proposed approach. Hence, the results framework will require significant revisions once the other requests in the review sheet directed towards the design of the project are addressed.</p> <p>March 23, 2014</p> <p>The project framework was totally revised and is now adequate.</p> <p>For Component Two, please note that by the time of CEO endorsement we expect hectare coverage to be clearly stated and a target for a management effectiveness score, as measured by the GEF tracking tool, to be an explicit outcome for this component covering the hectares in the ten regional protected areas.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	January 27, 2014  Yes.	July 6, 2016  Yes.
Project Design	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	January 27, 2014  The PIF is very weak on this aspect. GEF and many other donors have made and are making considerable investments in Colombia's protected area system focusing on systemic financial solutions as well as improving management effectiveness in various regions. The PIF fails to place the proposed intervention in any operational context with regards to system level issues impacting finance or management effectiveness.  In addition, by failing to describe the existing baseline conditions in any significant way, it is impossible for the PIF to present a rationale for the investment that is proposed within this project, which consists mainly of processes to develop plans in an unfocused way, that is, no rationale is presented on what protected area plans need updated and why are they prioritized, how much they might cost, what PAs are facing critical climate change risks, why investments are needed to improve the information management systems and how the GEF investment is incremental to that, etc.	July 6, 2016  Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>The biodiversity threat profiles of the areas identified for the investment are entirely absent thus providing no justification for the proposed solution of updating plans.</p> <p>Please improve this entire aspect of the PIF completely before resubmitting in line with the other changes requested in the PIF.</p> <p>March 23, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>January 27, 2014</p> <p>The components, outputs and outcomes are clear, however, they lack precision with regards to the number of protected areas, the hectare coverage of the protected areas, the financial gap that the project will fill with regards to PA management and how many protected areas will benefit from improved financial flows. In addition, the rationale for focusing on climate change and resiliency is not precisely characterized in any way. These issues are also raised in question 4 above.</p> <p>The implementation strategy of the project is entirely focused on plan development, with no mention of how the protected areas will address either threats to biodiversity and or barriers to successful PA management.</p> <p>Hence, the entire project concept is weak</p>	<p>July 6, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>in that the problem statement does not articulate the threats to biodiversity in the targeted protected areas and how updated management plans, CC adaptation or mitigation plans will resolve these threats and/or are the critical missing link to successful biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>Therefore, as noted elsewhere, the PIF has to revise the components, outcomes and outputs, as noted above, but also after a focused problem statement is presented, and a project strategy presented with a clear rationale. Currently, the PIF is a series of activities in search of a problem to solve.</p> <p>March 23, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>January 27, 2014</p> <p>Yes; however, please focus the GEBs descriptions on the specific protected areas that will be the focus of the project and improve the incremental reasoning once more precision is provided in the text and the problem statement better articulated.</p> <p>In addition, we would encourage the proponents to justify the geographic coverage of the project, which appears to be too expansive for the resources available for the project.</p> <p>March 23, 2014</p>	<p>July 6, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Adequate revisions.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		July 6, 2016  Adequate.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	January 27, 2014  No. Once more precision is provided with regards to where the project will work, provide more details and specifics.  March 23, 2014  Adequate revisions.	July 6, 2016  There is no substantive description of public participation, including CSOs and indigenous peoples, and an explanation of how they will participate and be engaged in the project. Please revise accordingly.  August 23, 2016  The treatment of this topic remains inadequate. It seems as though CSO are viewed as service providers rather than integral part of the design and development of the project. In every case, local CSOs will be vital to the success of the new PAs. IPs are also present in many of these areas - how will they be engaged in design?  October 3, 2016  Cleared.



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>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)</p>	<p>January 27, 2014</p> <p>No. The project fails to identify which protected areas are most at risk from climate change risks and how the project's focus on management plan updates will address this risk adequately.</p> <p>March 23, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	<p>July 6, 2016</p> <p>The risk of non participation of indigenous peoples and local communities is not adequately addressed. Please revise accordingly.</p> <p>August 23, 2016</p> <p>While the commitment to FPIC is welcome, it does not actually address prevention of non-participation of IPs. It does not relate to CSOs and local communities. The response for this should go hand in hand with question 10. Please revise.</p> <p>October 3, 2016</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>January 27, 2014</p> <p>No. Simply listing projects is not adequate. The GEF and other donors have in the past and currently are making significant investments in Colombia's protected area system. The project must be placed in this overall operational context and describe clearly how what is being proposed here is precisely complementary to existing investments by GEF and other donors.</p> <p>March 23, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	<p>July 6, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects,</b></p>	<p>January 27, 2014</p>	<p>July 6, 2016</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p><b>sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>As currently presented, there is nothing innovative about this project as what is proposed is a fairly generic response to a generic problem. The overall project design and strategy needs a great deal of articulation and a more specific presentation of the problem that the project will address.</p> <p>March 23, 2014</p> <p>Although the project design is much clearer now, it is not necessarily an innovative project, although a needed one for the protected area system.</p>	<p>As at PIF stage.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>July 6, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>July 6, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>January 27, 2014</p> <p>Because of the lack of specifics, it is impossible to tell whether funding is adequate.</p> <p>Project needs to identify how many management plans will be updated, what amount of GEF funds will be dedicated to implementation of said plans. In addition, as noted elsewhere, a clear rationale has to be presented on why</p>	<p>July 6, 2016</p> <p>The presentation of the cofinancing and the cofinance letters and the summary table is not clear.</p> <p>First, some letters are presented in US dollars, other letters are presented in Colombian pesos, but no exchange rate is presented.</p> <p>Please clarify how the US\$ figure was</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>management plans in certain areas must be updated as a priority, how this addressed key threats to the PA, and then, when applicable, how climate change issues will be addressed. Only with this level of specifics, can we know if the GEF funding is adequate.</p> <p>March 23, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	<p>arrived at in terms of cofinancing value.</p> <p>October 3, 2016</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>January 27, 2014</p> <p>As noted in question 16, given that the project framework is confusing, we can not tell if project cofinancing is adequate to produce the listed outcomes and outputs.</p> <p>There is no IADB operation or loan associated with this PIF and cash cofinance is being presented as IADB's contribution. Please clarify the role of IADB if this PIF is not associated with a loan.</p> <p>March 23, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	<p>July 6, 2016</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?</p>	<p>January 27, 2014</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>July 6, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>January 27, 2014</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>July 6, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<u>At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</u>		
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	January 27, 2014 NA.	July 6, 2016 NA.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		July 6, 2016 Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		July 6, 2016 Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		July 6, 2016 Yes.
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		July 6, 2016 Yes.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	January 27, 2014  No. The PIF needs major revisions as noted above. Please reconsider the title once the problem statement and the project strategy is reformulated. The PIF needs an entire overhaul and not cosmetic changes.  March 23, 2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Yes. Revisions are adequate. Please take note of requests to be met by the time of CEO endorsement above.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>July 6, 2016</p> <p>No. Please resolve the issues identified above and resubmit.</p> <p>August 23, 2016</p> <p>No. Please address the issues identified above and resubmit.</p> <p>October 3, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	First review*	January 27, 2014	July 06, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 23, 2014	August 23, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		October 03, 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.