



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

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| GEF ID: | 4619 | | |
| Country/Region: | Colombia | | |
| Project Title: | Third National Communication to the UNFCCC | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNDP | GEF Agency Project ID: | 4676 (UNDP) |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | Climate Change |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | CCM-6; CCM-6; Project Mana; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$0 | Project Grant: | \$2,000,000 |
| Co-financing: | \$1,682,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$3,682,000 |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | November 01, 2011 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Rawleston Moore | Agency Contact Person: | Raúl Alfaro, |

| 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? | Colombia is eligible. | |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | The operational focal point has endorsed the project, and a letter is on file | |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? | The project is an enabling activity, and UNDP has an extensive experience with these types of projects. UNDP assisted Colombia with the development of the first and second national communications. | |
| | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it? | N/A | |

*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) |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? | The projects fits into the agency's program and staff capacity in the country. | |
| Resource Availability | 6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? | The resources are available from the STAR Allocation. It should be noted that US\$1,500,000 is being requested from the STAR allocation, while , US\$500,000 is being requested from the focal area aside for enabling activities | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | | |
| Project Consistency | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework? | The project is aligned with GEF CCM results framework. The project once successfully implemented will assist Colombia to prepare its third national communications | |
| | 8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified? | The relevant GEF 5 focal area objective, CCM -6 support enabling activities and capacity building | |
| | 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? | National communications are a requirement by the UNFCCC for developing countries. | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | 10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes? | The outputs of the project will be used to assist Colombia with its low carbon development strategy and also be incorporated in the National Adaptation Plan of Colombia and the National Policy on Climate Change | |
| Project Design | 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? | The project responds to a requirement which countries have to prepare national communications to the UNFCCC. The project will build on previous national communications. | |
| | 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>The project is to assist in preparing the national communications for Colombia and thus it is not necessary to demonstrate additional reasoning. The project will prepare a greenhouse gas inventory for Colombia using IPCC guidelines for the years 2005, 2008, and 2010. The project will also provide information on vulnerability issues in Colombia. While the project will prepare inventories for 2005, 2008 and 2010, consideration should be given to revising the greenhouse gas inventory for the year 2000.</p> <p>Update 21st September 2011</p> <p>The explanation provided by UNDP is satisfactory. The recalculation of the GHG emissions for the year 2000,</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | | would not be required, given that the recalculation of the 1990-2008 period would be based on the methodology used for the year 200 and 2004. If revised information on activity data or emissions factors is made available then a recalculation of the inventory for the year 2000 will be carried out | |
| | 14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear? | The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear | |
| | 15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate? | The applied methodology for this project is appropriate | |
| | 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? | There is a clear description of the socio-economic benefits | |
| | 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly? | Public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people is taken into consideration in the project | |
| | 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) | The project takes into account potential major risks and identifies risk mitigation measures | |
| | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | The project is properly coordinated with other related initiatives | |
| | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate? | The project will be implemented by UNDP , with the National Institute on Hydrology, Meteorology and | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| | | Environment Studies. Further details should be provided at CEO Endorsement | |
| | 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? | | |
| Project Financing | 23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate? | The level of project management is appropriate | |
| | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | <p>The funding per objective is not appropriate. For Component 5 the proposed GEF Grant is US\$643,795, and the proposed outputs are (i) Report on key additional information relevant to the implementation of the Convention, as per the UNFCCC Guidelines., (ii) National GHG inventories, publications and documents from the NC for dissemination. (iii) Publication of the Third National Communication in hard copy and alternative media (CD and USB) and publication of the Executive Summary in Spanish and English and the two summaries targeting the public and decision-makers respectively. The proposed GEF resources for this activity are currently too high and inappropriate. A clarification is requested on this component</p> <p>Update September 21st 2011</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | The budget has been revised and the explanation provided is satisfactory. By CEO endorsement, please ensure that the project is aligned effectively with Colombia Technology Needs Assessment (TNA) under the UNEP TNA project. | |
| | 25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided. | The cofinance is appropriate. | |
| | 26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? | The cofinance amount that the agency is bringing to the project is in line with its role | |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for 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? | The PIF is currently not recommended for clearance . Clarification is requested on the amount of resources allocated to component 5 of the project. While the project will prepare inventories for 2005, 2008 and 2010, consideration should also be given to revising the | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|--|--|
| | | greenhouse gas inventory for the year 2000. Update September 21 2011 The PIF is recommended for clearance. The explanations provided are satisfactory. By CEO Endorsement the project should be effectively aligned with the Colombia Technology Needs Assessment (TNA) under the UNEP TNA project | |
| | 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* | | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |
| | 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.