



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in dry ecosystems to guarantee the flow of ecosystem services and to mitigate the processes of deforestation and desertification			
Country(ies):	Colombia	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	4772
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4720
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS); Autonomous Regional Corporation of the Upper Magdalena (CAM); Regional Autonomous Corporation of the Canal del Dique (CARDIQUE); Regional Autonomous Corporation of Cesar (CORPOCESAR); Regional Autonomous Corporation of La Guajira (CORPOGUAJIRA), Regional Autonomous Corporation of Tolima (CORTOLIMA); and Regional Autonomous Corporation of the Valle del Cauca (CVS)	Submission Date:	October 11, 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	MULTI FOCAL AREA	Project Duration(Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Agency Fee (\$):	878,781
➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/>			

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-1.	Outcome 1.1	Output 1. Output 2. Output 3.	GEFTF	4,569,666	13,721,385
LD-3.	Outcome 3.1. Outcome 3.2.	Output 3.1. Output 3.2. Output 3.4	GEFTF	2,021,198	6,230,166
SFM/REDD-2.	Outcome 2.1. Outcome 2.2.	Output 2.1. Output 2.2. Output 2.3. Output 2.4.	GEFTF	2,196,955	6,983,449
<b>Total project costs</b>				<b>8,787,819</b>	<b>26,935,000</b>

### B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

**Project Objective:** To reduce the current trend of dry forest deforestation and desertification processes and ensure the flow of multiple global ecosystem services through biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, and carbon storage.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
1. Strengthened implementation of the	TA	- 1,388,496 hectares (ha) of dry forest in protected	- Six (6) land use zoning plans (POTs)	GEFTF	Total: 2,235,570	6,464,400

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

<p>regulatory and land use planning framework facilitates the reduction of dry ecosystem deforestation and desertification processes.</p>		<p>areas (PAs) and/or conservation agreements nation wide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Twelve (12) local plans that incorporate BD conservation, SLM, and SFM strategies</li> <li>- 145 professionals and technical staff from the Regional Autonomous Corporations (CARs), Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS), the Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology, and Environmental Studies of Colombia (IDEAM), and land use agencies designing and implementing SLM, REDD+, and BD conservation strategies</li> <li>- Increase by 20% in the institutional capacity of six (6) CARs according to the UNDP's Capacity Development Scorecard</li> </ul>	<p>effectively contribute to the reduction of dry forest deforestation and degradation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capacity-building program directed to at least 80 regional and technical government officials and 20 social and grassroots organizations in BD conservation, SLM, and REDD+, and their articulation with local planning tools with a focus in gender and with cultural relevance</li> <li>- Regional geographic information systems (GIS) guide the local-level planning processes (POT and municipal development plan [PDM]) in BD conservation, SLM, and SFM, and are integrated into the national systems.</li> <li>- Measurement, Reporting, and Verification (MRV) protocols for monitoring deforestation in dry forests are applied, and articulated with municipal and regional territorial planning instruments (e.g., POT, POMCA, MDP, POF, etc.) to assess REDD+ benefits.</li> </ul>		<p>BD: 1,162,497 LD: 514,180 SFM/REDD: 558,893</p>	
<p>2. Delivery of multiple global environmental benefits through the declaration of PAs and/or conservation agreements, REDD+ practices, and SLM activities that strengthen the conservation and sustainable use of dry ecosystems.</p>	<p>TA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stable number of key species by biological groups (birds, plants, and ants) in permanent monitoring plots in the prioritized sites: Caribbean region (Birds: 6; Plants: 8 [trees]; Ants: 2); Inter-Andean Valley of the Magdalena River (Birds: 3; Plants: 5 [trees]; Ants: 2).</li> <li>- Up to 37 PAs or 12 conservation agreements that include dry ecosystems nationwide.</li> <li>- Improvement in the management effectiveness of three (3) PAs with dry ecosystems by 10% as measured by the METT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Up to 12 PAs and/or conservation agreements established or designated at the local and regional levels, in the Caribbean region and the Inter-Andean Valley of the Magdalena River (IAVMR) to ensure the flow of multiple global ecosystem services.</li> <li>- Participatory monitoring, surveillance, and enforcement mechanisms in place for 12 PAs and/or conservation agreements and supported by management plans and financial resources</li> </ul>	<p>GEFTF</p>	<p>Total: 6,134,831 BD: 3,191,364 LD: 1,411,847 SFM/REDD: 1,531,620</p>	<p>18,046,450</p>

	<p>scorecard: a) Atuncela Integrated Management District: from 49.02% to 59.02%; b) Los Besotes Wildlife Sanctuary: from 38.24% to 48.24%; and c) Los Ceibotes Protective Forest Reserve: from 35.29% to 45.29%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improvement in the financial capacity for the management of PAs with dry ecosystems by 10% according to that established through the total average score in the Financial Sustainability Scorecard (tracking tool): a) Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks: from 26.32% to 36.32%; b) Business planning and tools for cost-effective management: from 36% to 46%; c) Tools for revenue generation by PAs: from 25% to 35%; d) Total: from 28.44% to 38.44%. (Note: baseline and target will be confirmed during the first year of project implementation)</li> <li>- 21,447.4 ha of dry forest under REDD+ activities at the end of the project.</li> <li>- 93,700 identified carbon units (tCO<sub>2</sub>-e) for the carbon market at the end of the project.</li> <li>- Reduction of emissions from deforestation (areal biomass) at the end of the project: a) Garupal River watershed; 50,587 tCO<sub>2</sub>-e; b) Dagua River watershed: 43,113 tCO<sub>2</sub>-e.</li> <li>- Reduction of emissions from deforestation (below ground biomass) at the end of the project: a) Garupal River watershed; X tCO<sub>2</sub>-e; b) Dagua River watershed: X tCO<sub>2</sub>-e (target will be defined during the first year of project execution)</li> <li>- Avoided deforestation</li> </ul>	<p>derived from government funds (i.e., CARs) and other sources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technical, financial, social, and institutional information to assess the feasibility of developing REDD+ projects in 21,447.4 ha of dry forest (3,629.6 ha in the Caribbean region and 17,817.8 ha in the IAVMR) and contributes to regional sustainability through maintenance of ecosystem services.</li> <li>- Roadmap for REDD+ initiative in the dry forest defined.</li> <li>- Monitoring system allows follow-up on global benefits from BD conservation, SLM, and REDD+ with emphasis on the projects prioritized sites and articulated with the national monitoring systems.</li> <li>- Landscape management tools (e.g., silvopastoral systems, hedgerows, biological corridors, etc.), sustain water flows, and reduce land degradation /desertification processes for 6 watersheds (3 in the Caribbean region and 3 in the IAVMR) implemented and included in land use and environmental plans.</li> <li>- Local agreements for establishing landscape management tools (i.e., biological corridors, hedgerows, windbreaks, etc.), that maintain the forest cover (up to 1,000 ha) in sustainable production systems (silvopastoral systems, PES, agroforestry, etc.).</li> <li>- Up to six (6) ecological rehabilitation pilot projects (using native species) for dry forests in place to</li> </ul>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

	<p>at the end of the project: a) Garupal River watershed; 522.65 ha; b) Dagua River watershed: 445.42 ha.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stable flow contributed by the HRU in each prioritized watershed: a) Cañas River: 12 m<sup>3</sup>/s (dry season); b) Garupal River: 0.53 m<sup>3</sup>/s (dry season); c) Arroyo Grande: No data available (will be estimated during the first year of project implementation); d) Aipe River: 3.1 m<sup>3</sup>/s (dry season); e) Yaví River: 2.42 m<sup>3</sup>/s (dry season); f) Dagua River: 12.9 m<sup>3</sup>/s (upper section, dry season).</li> <li>- Reduction by 20% of sediments (Total Suspended Solids - TSS) contributed by the HRU in each prioritized watershed: a) Cañas River: from 222 to 88.8 t/ha/year; b) Garupal River: No data available*; c) Arroyo Grande: No data available*; d) Aipe River: from 10.5 to 4.2 t/ha/year; e) Yaví River: from 100 to 40 t/ha/year; f) Dagua River: from 200 to 80 t/ha/year (* Will be estimated during the first year of project implementation).</li> <li>- 1,000 ha of dry ecosystems restored.</li> </ul>	facilitate connectivity between these forests and buffer zones of three (3) PAs.			
Subtotal				8,370,401	24,510,850
Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>3</sup> (BD: 215,805; LD: 95,171; SFM/REDD+: 106,442)			GEFTF	417,418	2,424,150
<b>Total project costs</b>				<b>8,787,819</b>	<b>26,935,000</b>

### C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	IAvH	In-kind	947,156
National Government	IAvH	Grant	117,647

<sup>3</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

Local Government	CARDIQUE	In-kind	873,423
Local Government	CARDIQUE	Grant	582,282
Local Government	CORPOCESAR	In-kind	294,118
Local Government	CORPOCESAR	Grant	5,145,291
Local Government	CAM	In-kind	294,118
Local Government	CAM	Grant	294,118
Local Government	CORPOGUAJIRA	In-kind	989,880
Local Government	CORPOGUAJIRA	Grant	1,487,249
Local Government	CVC	In-kind	1,067,647
Local Government	CVC	Grant	1,602,941
Private Sector	ECOPETROL	In-kind	2,000,000
Private Sector	ECOPETROL	Grant	2,000,000
Others	Patrimonio Natural	Grant	4,300,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	4,939,130
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>26,935,000</b>

#### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	BD	Colombia	4,569,666	456,966	5,026,632
UNDP	GEF TF	LD	Colombia	2,021,198	202,120	2,223,318
UNDP	GEF TF	SFM/REDD	Colombia	2,196,955	219,695	2,416,650
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				<b>8,787,819</b>	<b>878,781</b>	<b>9,666,600</b>

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

#### F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	42,000	0	42,000
National/Local Consultants	27,000	0	27,000

#### G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

## PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

### A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>4</sup>

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

1. The project will contribute to the implementation of the 2011-2020 Strategic Plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity (i.e., Aichi Targets). More specifically, the project will contribute to achieving the following Targets: a) **Target 1:** By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably; b) **Target 2:** By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been

<sup>4</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems; c) **Target 5:** By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced; d) **Target 7:** By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture, and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity; e) **Target 11:** By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascapes; f) **Target 12:** By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained; g) **Target 14:** By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable; h) **Target 15:** By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification; and i) **Target 19:** By 2020, knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. NA

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage: NA

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

2. As part of the preparatory process for implementation of national actions related to the reduction of emissions associated with the degradation and deforestation processes, the Government of Colombia has been participating in the initiative led by the Forest Carbon Partnership Fund (FCPF) in the consolidation of the REDD+ Preparation Proposal, or the R-PP. In this document prior actions are described for the structuring and implementation of a National Strategy for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (ENREDD+). To date, eight drafts of this document have been presented for comments; the most recent draft, which corresponds to the seventh version (Version 7.1 – May, 2013).

3. The latest version of the R-PP (Version 7.1, MADS 2013) mentions that it will be implemented between July 2011 and July 2015; however; in August 2013 the R-PP activities had not yet begun. The R-PP includes the following REDD+ readiness activities: a) Organization and carrying out of consultations; b) Preparation of the REDD+ strategy; c) Development of a national reference scenario for forest emissions or a national forest reference; d) Design of a national forest monitoring system and an information system about safeguards; and e) Schedule and budget; and f) Design of a framework for program monitoring and evaluation. Component 1 includes the definition of national management mechanisms for the preparation for REDD+, the exchange of information and initial dialogue with the principal interested parties, and the consultation and participation processes. Subcomponent 1(c) includes the consultation and participation processes with a budget of \$4,695,000 USD, \$398,000 of which will be provided through the UN-REDD Program. Component 2 of the R-PP includes an evaluation of land use, agents of change in land use, forestry law, policy and management, and the definition of actions for transparency and regulation of early REDD+ activities and projects, and the evaluation of social and environmental impacts during the preparation and execution of REDD+. This component has a total budget of \$8,165,000 USD.

4. Component 3 of the R-PP has a budget of \$3,079,000 USD for the development of national and regional reference scenarios and the assessment of trends of deforestation and carbon stocks. Project results regarding REDD+ will contribute to sub-national and local reference assessments. The development of a national Measuring, Reporting, and Verification (MRV) system has been included in component 4(a) of the R-PP. This component has a budget of \$6,120,000 USD, and it includes the development of: a) a monitoring system for forests and carbon in Colombia; b) estimations of carbon content; c) estimation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as a result of deforestation; d) national and sub-national information systems; e) community participation during the MRV process, among others. In addition, the component 4(b) of the R-PP includes the development of information system of the multiple benefits, other impacts, management, and safeguards. This component has a budget of \$924,000 USD.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

5. The project design underwent some modifications with regard to the strategy that was originally defined in the PIF. While the structure of the components of the project resembles the PIF that was approved by the GEF in January 2012, there was a reduction in cofinancing, which led to adjustments being made to the scope of several of the project's outputs and the expected global environmental benefits. The reduction in the cofinancing was from \$39,460,200 USD to \$26,935,000 USD; the adjustments made to the project outputs are described below:

PIF Outputs	Project Document Outputs
Component 1	
Seventeen (17) Land Use Zoning Plans (POT, in Spanish) effectively contribute to the reduction of dry forest deforestation and desertification processes.	Six (6) land use zoning plans (POTs) effectively contribute to the reduction of dry forest deforestation and degradation.  As a result of reduced cofinancing, the scope of this output was reduced to six (6) municipalities (3 in the Caribbean region and 3 in the IAVMR). In addition, there was a change in the focus of the output in order to comply with the directives of the PAN regarding the inclusion of dry forest in the land use planning processes, and thereby reducing desertification and drought in areas containing this ecosystem.
At least 6 Watershed Management Plans (POMCAs, in Spanish), as well as other local and regional land planning instruments (e.g., Municipal Development Plans [MDP]) effectively contribute to the reduction of dry forest deforestation and desertification processes	As a result of reduced cofinancing, this output was excluded from the project's final design due to the high cost for the development of the POMCAs.
Strengthened capacity of 80 national and regional technical government officials (60 CARs + 10 IDEAM, + 10 MADS), and 340 community members in BD conservation (i.e., management of PAs, tools to increase landscape connectivity among dry forest fragments); SLM (i.e., methodologies to estimate soil degradation and loss); and REDD+ (i.e., opportunity costs, reference levels, estimation, and implementation of environmental safeguards).	Capacity building program directed to at least 80 regional and technical government officials and 20 social and grassroots organizations in BD conservation, SLM, and REDD+, and their articulation with local planning tools with a focus in gender and with cultural relevance.  Capacity strengthening will be done through a training program which will widen the scope of this project output in order to include gender and cultural considerations in order to guarantee that the benefits also reach women's and ethnic groups living in the prioritized sites and municipalities.
Municipal-level geographic information system (GIS) mapping tool for sustainable forest management (SFM)/SLM and BD benefits guide national and regional decision-makers in the development and implementation of municipal and regional territorial planning instruments (e.g., POT, POMCA, MDP, Forest Management Plans [POF, in Spanish], etc.).	Regional geographic information systems (GIS) guide the local-level planning processes (POT and PDM) in BD conservation, SLM, and SFM, and are integrated into the national systems.  The GIS will be operated by regional environmental officials (CARS) to serve the municipalities. This option is more feasible and cost-effective than the installation of the GIS directly in the municipality as was considered by the PIF, because of technical and capacity limitations that exist in the municipalities.
Measurement, Reporting, and Verification (MRV) protocols for monitoring deforestation in dry forests are applied, and articulated with municipal and regional territorial planning	Measurement, Reporting, and Verification (MRV) protocols for monitoring deforestation in dry forests are applied, and articulated with municipal and regional territorial planning instruments (e.g., POT, POMCA, MDP, POF, etc.) to assess REDD+ benefits.

instruments (e.g., POT, POMCA, MDP, POF, etc.) to assess REDD+ and BD benefits.	
Component 2	
At least 11 local and regional PAs in the Caribbean region and 6 in the Inter-Andean Valley of the Magdalena River have been declared and are operationalised to ensure the flow of multiple global ecosystem services.	Up to 12 PAs and/or conservation agreements established or designated at the local and regional levels, in the Caribbean region and the Inter-Andean Valley of the Magdalena River to ensure the flow of multiple global ecosystem services.  It was determined that there will be up to 12 new local and regional PAs, and/or conservation agreements, that may be established based on the analyses of conservation opportunities and feasibility (development of consultations with environmental officials and technical studies) that were performed during the PPG phase. In addition, the establishment of conservation agreements with the local population is considered a BD and dry forest conservation and sustainable use option, which can be effectively substituted for the creation of new PAs. In addition, the cost of establishing conservation agreements is less than the cost of a new PA. The establishment of conservation agreements was considered based on the successful experience that is being developed as part of the medium-sized GEF project <i>Institutional and Policy Strengthening to increase BD conservation on private lands in Colombia</i> .
Monitoring, surveillance, and enforcement mechanisms in place for 17 PAs and supported by management plans and financial resources derived from government funds (i.e., CARs), REDD+ incentives, and other sources.	Participatory monitoring, surveillance, and enforcement mechanisms in place for 12 PAs and/or conservation agreements and supported by management plans and financial resources derived from government funds (i.e., CARs) and other sources.  The monitoring, surveillance, and enforcement mechanisms must be participatory in order for them to be more effective and sustainable.
REDD+ pilot project protects 123,596 ha of dry forest in private lands (78,689 ha in the Caribbean region and 44,898 ha in the Magdalena River Valley) and contributes to regional sustainability through maintenance of ecosystem services.	Technical, financial, social, and institutional information to assess the feasibility of developing REDD+ projects in 21,447.4 ha of dry forest (3,629.6 ha in the Caribbean region and 17,817.8 ha in the Inter-Andean Magdalena River Valley) and contributes to regional sustainability through maintenance of ecosystem services.  During the PPG phase, communities were informed through socialization workshops about the efforts that are being made to consolidate the necessary technical inputs to establish the technical, financial, social, and institutional feasibility of a REDD+ project for the dry forest. This socialization process will continue during the implementation phase in order to establish the feasibility of a REDD+ project for dry forest through a consultation process with national, regional, and local stakeholders.  As was mentioned previously, the number of participating municipalities in the project was reduced from seventeen (17) to six (6). Among the six (6) prioritized municipalities, the two with the largest coverage of tropical dry forest (21,447.4 ha combined) and where deforestation occurs due to unplanned changes in land use, will be initially included in the REDD+ project. This explains the reduction in area (ha) under REDD+ implementation as originally shown in the PIF.
Methodology for the REDD+ pilot project in	Roadmap for REDD+ initiative in the dry forest defined.



dry forest ecosystems is developed	Instead of developing a methodology for the REDD+ pilot project in the dry forests, a roadmap will be defined for a REDD+ project in the dry forest with a REDD+ methodology that has already been approved, such as those of the VCS.
Monitoring system at the local level (municipalities) tracks global environmental benefits from BD conservation, REDD+, and SLM	Monitoring system allows follow-up on global benefits from BD conservation, SLM, and REDD+ with emphasis on the projects prioritized sites and articulated with the national monitoring systems.  The monitoring system that will be developed by the project will be articulated to the national monitoring systems (MADS, IAvH, and IDEAM) so that the project may contribute information to national BD, REDD+, and MSS inventories.
Landscape Management Tools (e.g., silvopastoral systems, hedgerows, biological corridors, etc.) sustain water flows and reduce land degradation/desertification processes for 6 watersheds (3 in the Caribbean region and 3 in the Magdalena River Valley) are in place and defined by SLM plans.	Landscape management tools (e.g., silvopastoral systems, hedgerows, biological corridors, etc.), sustain water flows, and reduce land degradation/desertification processes for 6 watersheds (3 in the Caribbean region and 3 in the Inter-Andean Valley of the Magdalena Valley) implemented and included in land use and environmental plans.
Private landowners' agreements used for establishing landscape management tools (i.e., biological corridors, live fences, wind breakers, etc.), that maintain the forest cover (1,600 ha) in agricultural/cattle ranching production landscapes.	Local agreements for establishing landscape management tools (i.e., biological corridors, hedgerows, windbreaks, etc.), that maintain the forest cover (up to 1,000 ha) in sustainable production systems (silvopastoral systems, PES, agroforestry, etc.)  The local agreements may be established with small- and medium-scale landowners or land holders depending on the situation of land tenure in each prioritized watershed. The reduction in the number of hectares (from 1,600 to 1,000 ha) is based on the analysis developed during the PPG to establish the technical and economic feasibility of the implementation of landscape management tools (LMT) during the life of the project (5 years) and with the available resources as a result of reduced cofinancing.
Ecological rehabilitation pilot projects (using native species) for dry forests are in place.	Up to six (6) ecological rehabilitation pilot projects (using native species) for dry forests in place to facilitate connectivity between these forests and buffer zones of three (3) PAs.  These projects are specified as ecological rehabilitation in accordance with the technical and economic feasibility. Rehabilitation is understood as the actions necessary to repair the functions of the degraded ecosystems (in this case the dry forest) with the main objective of increasing the productivity of the ecosystems to benefit the local population (based on J. Aronsod, C. Fled, E. Le Floc'h, C. Ode, and R Pontanier. Rehabilitation of degraded ecosystems in arid and semi-arid lands. I. A view from the South. <i>Restoration Ecology</i> , March, 1993).
At least 5 community-operated plant nurseries (3 in the Caribbean region and 2 in the Magdalena River Valley) are used to grow and manage native tree species for ecological rehabilitation purposes.	This project output was included as part of the activities for the implementation of the ecological rehabilitation pilot projects using native species. Only two nurseries will be established, one in each region of the project as a result of reduced cofinancing.

6. Despite the reduction in scope of some of the project outputs, the project will still deliver important global environmental benefits in terms of BD conservation (e.g., 18,000 ha of tropical dry ecosystems protected, and enhanced connectivity for 9,623 ha of tropical dry forest), avoided GHG emissions (93,700 tCO<sub>2</sub>-e during a 5-year period), and soil protection and water conservation (e.g., stable water flow in six [6] prioritized watersheds and reduction by 20% in sedimentation in six [6] prioritized watersheds), among other benefits.

7. Additionally, the GEF financial resources per project component were redistributed as part of the necessary adjustments made to meet the new needs of implementation and the achievement of global environmental benefits, as shown below:

Component	Total Budget (PIF)		Total Budget (CEO Endorsement Request)	
	Budget	Percentage of total budget	Budget	Percentage of total budget
Component 1	2,511,120	28.6%	2,235,570	25.4%
Component 2	5,859,281	66.7%	6,134,831	69.8%
Management costs	417,418	4.7%	417,418	4.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8,787,819</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>8,787,819</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

A.6. Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

Risk		Risk Mitigation Strategy
1. Uncertainty regarding future support of the project by government officials (national, regional, and local).	L	In Colombia the turnover of technical and operational staff in government institutions is low, and as such this type of career administrative officials will remain active members of the project (in the national, regional, and local institutions), despite the potential changes at the directional or top levels of the institutions. They will be duly informed of the processes that will be developed and as such the project will not experience major risk in terms of institutional support. However, it should be recognized that Colombia has presidential elections every 4 years, the next elections being held in 2014, and the election of new mayors and new directors of CARs in 2015; in this regard, and to reinforce the internal dynamic of the government institutions, the UNDP country office will systematize and inform the new officials about the project's objectives and benefits. To maintain the interest of the new officials in the project, the UNDP country office will keep them informed about progress, results, and products through the use of different resources (e.g., steering committees, processes for transferring knowledge and learning, field visits, etc.).
2. Limited capacity in the government (national, regional, and local) for SFM/REDD+.	M/L	The project will mitigate the risk associated with strengthening forest governance, especially at the municipal (local) level, which will be supported by the development of land use planning instruments that include SFM, as well as tools to support decision-making with regard to SFM, including its monitoring. In addition, the project will provide training in REDD+, SLM, and BD conservation to national, regional, and local officials, while at the same time generating incentives to facilitate the adoption of the related activities.
3. Uncertainty related to land ownership rights and the use of forest resources.	M	To reduce the risk related to a lack of clarity in terms of land ownership rights (an aspect that is particularly important for the REDD+ pilot projects and the establishment of LMT) and the use of forest resources, the project will begin the process to define land ownership at the beginning of the formulation and development of the REDD+ activities only in dry forests where land tenure can be demonstrated with title deeds. The process to define land ownership rights and the use of forest resources will continue during the early phase of implementation as part of a social feasibility analysis of a REDD+ project and will be closely monitored through UNDP's Environmental and Social Screening Procedure (ESSP). The project will be worked on closely with the regional and local authorities, the individual landowners/landholders and communal land owners for such purpose. The Caribbean region has experienced more problems related to uncertainty of land ownership than the IAVMR. With regard to the REDD+ pilot projects, the proponents of the project shall have demonstrated rights of ownership over the reduction of GHG emissions in order to receive the pertinent benefits. As part of the technical, financial, social, and institutional feasibility for a REDD+ project, a detailed analysis of tenure of the land and forests will be performed during project

		implementation. Possible conflicts over ownership rights to emissions reductions will be solved considering the social safeguards required by REDD+ projects, those required by the Ministry of the Interior regarding communal lands (indigenous and afro-Colombian communities), and those to be defined by the Government of Colombia under ENREDD+. Additionally, consultations with parties interested in implementing REDD+ activities were initiated during the PPG phase and included local workshops with members of afro-Colombian communities. For the implementation of REDD+ activities and benefit-sharing, the project will consider the collective rights of these communities to the land and natural resources. This consultation process will continue during project implementation.
4. Lack of engagement and participation of local communities in PA management /conservation agreements, and REDD+ project	L	<p>The establishment of regional PAs and/or conservation agreements and the development of their management plans will be done with the active participation of the local communities. These activities will be closely monitored through the project’s annual work plans and annual reviews, and as part of the UNDP’s ESSP, to ensure that all requirements regarding consultations and participation with local communities are satisfied as required by the Law (MADS Decree 2372, 2010) and in coordination with the Ministry of the Interior for those cases involving indigenous and/or afro-Colombian communities.</p> <p>Additionally, the project will bring multiple benefits to local stakeholders including the equitable distribution of benefits from payments (incentives) related to a REDD+ project; the implementation of LMT, including the agroforestry and silvopastoral systems that will increase the income for the small- and medium-scale landowners; and improving the skills of local community members (including women) by training them in the principles and practices of REDD+, SLM, and BD conservation, motivating them to participate in the project. With regard to the REDD+ project, further information on REDD+, its use, and the related challenges and opportunities, how the different stakeholders can participate, as well as their rights, including land tenure rights, and responsibilities will be provided during project implementation to increase local communities’ interest and promote their participation. This will include the technical, financial, social, and institutional feasibility of a REDD+ project for the dry forest with the active participation of the local communities of the Garupal River watershed and the Dagua River watershed, where the REDD+ project will be implemented.</p> <p>Finally, the project has designed a stakeholder participation plan through which local stakeholders, including women, will be engaged in multiple phases of project execution, including planning, implementation of specific project activities, and monitoring and evaluation.</p>
5. Degradation and damage of the dry ecosystems as a result of the occurrence of extreme climatic events.	M	The risks related to climate change may include floods, landslides, and prolonged droughts. This situation may cause changes to the biotic communities, loss of soil, and increased risk to the local communities. The project’s activities with regard to REDD+, SLM, and BD conservation include the maintenance and improvement of forest coverage, which will facilitate the maintenance and rehabilitation of the native forest cover. In addition, the project will establish connectivity between dry forest patches and will establish biological corridors that will facilitate the dispersion of species and thereby increase their resilience to the potential impacts of climate change and variability.

#### A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:

8. This project will complement the activities that are being developed by the Regional System of Protected Areas of the Colombian Caribbean (SIRAP-Caribe), which is the “set of private and public PAs in their different management categories, which are interrelated with specific conservation objectives that are encountered in a determined region of the country.” The creation of SIRAP-Caribe is an effective strategy to ensure the development of the region, conserving its genetic capability, resources, and ecosystems that offer countless ecosystem services, and guaranteeing the survival of the cultures and the future of the region. This project will be articulated with the initiatives that the SIRAP develops to increase its regional appropriation, incorporating the lessons learned with respect to the work of declaring and managing PAs and in the themes of ecological rehabilitation and sustainable practices. In addition, lessons learned from the Tití Project will be incorporated. Although it is focused on the preservation of the cotton-top tamarin (*Saguinus oedipus*), a critically endangered species, the project has progressed actions relevant to the ecological rehabilitation of the dry ecosystems where the tamarin lives. Project Tití activities will contribute to the development of this project through provision of information resulting from scientific research on the structure, composition, functioning, and

dynamics of dry tropical forests, but also through lessons learned from working with local communities, especially in the Caribbean region, in BD conservation and SLM.

9. The project will incorporate lessons learned about the establishment of conservation agreements with private landowners that have been made within the framework of the GEF project *Institutional and policy strengthening to increase BD conservation on private lands in Colombia*. This medium-sized project is being executed by The Nature Conservancy (TNC) with support from the UNDP and will end in 2014. Lessons learned from the GEF project *Sustainable Colombian cattle ranching project* will be incorporated from the implementation of silvopastoral systems that contribute to BD conservation in cattle-ranching production landscapes. This project is being executed by the Colombian Federation of Cattle Ranchers (FEDEGAN) and the Center for Research on Sustainable Livestock Production Systems (CIPAV) with support from the World Bank.

10. In addition, the project will coordinate actions with the M&SDST Program being coordinated by the MADS and IDEAM regarding the development of an information system to monitor soil degradation; the socialization, awareness, and education about monitoring and follow-up of soil and land degradation; its causes and consequences; management and rehabilitation plans; and the development of a monitoring and follow-up program for land degradation.

11. The project will also coordinate actions with the Natural Patrimony Foundation and the Colombian Environmental Program (PROMAC), groups that through funding by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) are driving actions for: a) improving the management of BD areas, including PAs; b) strengthening the capacity of the national government, community organizations, and civil society groups to manage, plan, and protect natural resources; and c) providing technical support for the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change. This includes, among other aspects, support from the USAID and the national REDD+ strategy, the development of an MRV system, and the improved capacity of the Government of Colombia to develop a strategy for lowering emissions (LEDS).

12. Last, this project will articulate its activities with the GEF project *Sustainable management and conservation of biodiversity of the Magdalena river basin*, which will be implemented by TNC with support from the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB). This project seeks to contribute to BD conservation and the rehabilitation of ecosystems to support and maintain the ecosystem services through conservation activities in priority habitats, the design of tools and methodologies to improve the management of aquatic BD, improving governance and strengthening local capacity. Additionally, this project will coordinate action with the UNFCCC Adaptation Fund Project *Reducing risk and vulnerability to climate change in the region of La Depresión Momposina in Colombia* currently under implementation. This project has as its objective to reduce the vulnerability of local communities and wetlands in the La Depresión Momposina region (Caribbean region) to risks associated with flooding and drought, which result from variability and climate change. In addition, the project will articulate its activities with the UNDP project *Integrated Risk Management*, which is being developed in the Caribbean and has as its objective to work in themes of climate change and risk management at the institutional level with the national environmental system and the risk management system in the entire Caribbean region.

13. The project will also coordinate and exchange experiences with CORPOCESAR and the Institute of Natural Sciences of the National University of Colombia. Through a scientific cooperation agreement between them to characterize biota and the physical medium in areas under the jurisdiction of the CORPOCESAR, these institutions are performing a study on carbon sequestration in the Los Besotes Ecological Park.

## **B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

14. During the PPG phase of the project, key stakeholders participated in planning and project design workshops and several smaller focus group sessions and meetings. These participatory forums were the following: a) PPG phase inception workshop and b) project Results Framework Workshop. Additionally, multiple individual meetings and consultations with key national, regional, and local stakeholders were held during the PPG phase by the project team, UNDP CO, and staff from the MADS. Descriptions of the PPG phase workshops are presented below.

15. Inception Workshop of the PPG Phase. The Inception Workshop was held on July 31, 2012 in the city of Bogotá, Colombia. The principal objective of this workshop was to ensure the different stakeholders' knowledge of the PIF and PPG formats approved by the GEF for the project, and to define the work plan for the final design of the project. The specific objectives were to: a) inform about the institutional and operational framework for the formulation of the

project; b) inform about mechanisms and specific requirements for the PPG phase; c) inform about the project's objective and expected results; d) coordinate actions and commitments with all partners involved; and e) inform about the responsibilities of the team of consultants.

16. The participants in the PPG Phase Inception Workshop included staff from the MADS, IAvH, UAESPNN, and IDEAM, representatives from the CARs (CORPOGUAJIRA, CDMB, CORPOCESAR, CAM, CORTOLIMA y CVC), UNDP CO staff, and the PPG project team.

17. Project Results Framework Workshop. The Results Framework Workshop was held on October 9-10, 2012 in Bogota, Colombia. The objectives of this workshop were to: a) define the Results Framework, including the revised project outputs, indicators, baseline information, goals, verification mechanisms, and assumptions; b) preliminary definition of the project's activities for each outcome/output; c) define a preliminary budget for the project, including the co-financing; and d) update the PPG phase Work Plan.

18. The participants in the PPG Phase Inception Workshop included staff from the MADS, IAvH, UAESPNN, and IDEAM, representatives from the CARs, UNDP CO staff, and the PPG project team.

**Stakeholder Participation Plan for the Project Implementation Phase**

19. Objectives of the Stakeholder Participation Plan: The formulation of the stakeholder participation plan had the following objectives: a) to clearly identify the basic roles and responsibilities of the main participants in this project, b) to ensure full knowledge of those involved concerning the progress and obstacles in project development and to take advantage of the experience and skills of the participants to enhance project activities, and c) to identify key instances in the project cycle where stakeholder involvement will occur. The ultimate purpose of the stakeholder participation plan will be the long-term sustainability of the project achievements, based on transparency and the effective participation of the key stakeholders.

20. During the PPG phase, local consultations were held regarding the participation of women through local socialization workshops in five (5) of the six (6) municipalities prioritized by the project and through filling out the form *Characterization and evaluation of stakeholders training needs in the areas of Project* and through the question *Knowledge of initiatives with a gender perspective in the project area, with emphasis on women*. Information about the existence of women's organizations was obtained as well as their work related to food security and sustainable production projects, among other issues associated with dry forest and other dry ecosystems.

**Summary of Stakeholder Roles in Project Implementation:**

Stakeholders	Project Implementation Role
MADS	MADS is the Global Environment Facility (GEF) focal point. The MADS is principally charged with developing national policy related to the environment and renewable natural resources, and establishing the rules and criteria for environmental planning for land use to ensure the sustainable use of renewable natural resources and the environment. MADS will be charged with guiding policies and regulations related to BD conservation, reduced deforestation of the dry forests, and reduction of the related desertification process and regulation of water resources, as well as the fight against desertification and drought.
IDEAM	The IDEAM is the institute charged with carrying out studies and research about natural resources, especially those related to forest resources and soil conservation. IDEAM will provide information about the country's biophysical resources, particularly with regard to contamination and degradation of these resources, which are necessary for decision-making by the CARs and local officials. The institute will also be charged with developing and facilitating access to technical support, methodology, and services for the REDD+ and SLM activities.
IAvH	The IAvH is charged with carrying out, in the country's continental territory, scientific research on BD, including hydrobiological and genetic resources. In addition, the IAvH coordinates the National Biodiversity Information System (SIB)) and the conformation of the national BD inventory. The IAvH will provide assistance to the project in the design of information management and monitoring systems for BD, so that the information is available through the SIB and contributes to monitoring and inventorying BD in the tropical dry forest. The IAvH is one of the project co-financers.
Regional Autonomous Corporations (CARs)	CORPOCESAR, CAM, Regional Autonomous Corporation of La Guajira (CORPOGUAJIRA), Regional Autonomous Corporation of the Canal del Dique (CARDIQUE), CORTOLIMA, and CVS. The CARs are public corporate entities created by law composed of territorial entities that due to their characteristics constitute geographically the same ecosystem or form a geopolitical, biogeographic, or hydrogeographic unit endowed with administrative and financial autonomy, its own resources, and legal status charged by law to manage within their area of jurisdiction the environment and renewable natural resources with the goal of achieving sustainable development according the legal and policy conditions of the MADS. The CARs are charged with the regional implementation of national instruments of public policy. In addition, they are direct partners with the project in terms of training in REDD+, SLM, and BD conservation themes. They have the legal power to declare regional PAs and are co-financers of the project.
Municipalities (6)	Valledupar, Dibulla, and San Juan de Nepomuceno (Caribbean region); Natagaima, Aipe, and Dagua (IAVMR). The municipalities will develop and adopt land use plans referred to in the Development Plan Law and Law 388 of 1997; specifically

	regulate land uses in urban area, areas of expansion, and rural areas in accordance with the law; optimize use of available lands and coordinate sectoral plans in harmony with national policies and departmental and urban center plans. The municipalities will be direct beneficiaries of the project in terms of training in REDD+, SLM, and BD conservation, in addition for their incorporation into local planning instruments (POTs and PDMs). The municipal authorities may establish local PAs.
Local communities	The local communities are owners of the land they live upon and make use of the dry forest. The local communities that live in the project's prioritized sites include peasant communities, afro-Colombian communities, and indigenous communities; the latter are authorities within their territory. The local communities are charged with field implementation (together with the CARs) of the BD conservation, SFM/REDD+, and SLM activities. In addition, they will be direct beneficiaries of the project in terms of training in SFM/REDD+, SLM, and BD conservation, and they are the ones who will ensure the sustainability of the activities over time.
Private sector	The private sector includes landowners and they are also represented by producers' associations. They will promote, strengthen, and give sustainability to the project's activities (related agencies to be determined), particularly the implementation of agroforestry and silvopastoral systems.
NGOs	The NGOs will promote the conservation and sustainable use of BD. Many of their mission activities are consistent with the project objectives. The following local CSOs have been identified as potential local partners for the planning and implementation of the project: Fundación Ecosistemas Secos de Colombia, Fundación Herencia Ambiental Caribe (Atlántico), Fundación Titi (Atlántico), Fundación CEUDES (Tolima), Fundación Manos Unidas (Tolima), Fundación Vida Natural (Barranquilla), Corporación Ambiental Cuchiyuyo (Huila), el Grupo de Estudios Ecológicos OIKOS (Huila), Fundación El Curibano (Huila), among others. At the national level, the Fondo Patrimonio Natural and the Fondo para la Acción Ambiental y la Niñez are also found. These organizations, in addition to their experience in the conservation and sustainable use and recovery of tropical dry forests, also have experience working with local communities, municipal authorities, and the CARs, and may be able to implement with specific activities in the project.
UNDP	The UNDP is the Project's Implementing Agency and will be responsible for overall project implementation through the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM). It is the entity that will provide technical guidance to the project, supervise field activities, guarantee the effective investment of resources, and guarantee the appropriation and replication of the results.

21. **Participation Mechanisms:** Three key phases for stakeholders' participation have been identified for the implementation phase of the project: planning, implementation, and evaluation. **Project planning** will include annual meetings with key stakeholders including national and local governments, civil society, local communities (indigenous groups, afro-Colombians, and peasants), and co-financiers, during which annual goals will be established for each project component. These annual planning meetings will also serve to specify the activities that are to be funded through each co-financing source.

22. **Project implementation** will take place according to the annual plans that are approved by the SC, which will be formed by the following agencies: the UNDP and the MADS; other responsible parties and the CARs may be invited to be part of the SC. The Project Director may invite other key project stakeholders to participate (e.g., municipalities, NGOs, and community organizations) to ensure active participation and full representation. In addition, key stakeholders will be direct beneficiaries of project activities, including training and management of PAs and/or conservation agreements. During project design, the opinions and views of the community members regarding their participation in the implementation phase as well as who participated in the project socialization workshops were considered. This process of socialization and community consultation will continue during implementation.

23. **Project evaluation** will occur annually with the participation of key stakeholders at the end of each planning year and previous to defining the annual plan for the following year of project implementation. It is emphasized that the monitoring of the project and specific monitoring activities planned as part of the project strategy (Section 2 of this Project Document) will be participatory in nature; these activities will include gender considerations in order to ensure the participation of both women and men and the equitable distribution of benefits and for which specific indicators have been included in the Project Results Framework (Section 3.2 of this Project Document). Also, mid-term and final evaluations will be carried out as part of the project cycle. Due to the independent nature of these evaluations, they will be key moments during the project's life when stakeholders, including the local communities, local organizations, and government, can express their views, concerns, and assess whether the project's outcomes are being achieved, and if necessary, define the course of correction.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF):

24. The local communities living within the dry ecosystems of the Caribbean region and the Inter-Andean Valley of the Magdalena River are mostly peasants with few economic resources. In general terms, they use the forest to collect firewood

and to a lesser extent to extract timber, many times illegally. Regarding the socioeconomic conditions, the dry areas of Colombia present high levels of poverty. The project will benefit these communities through: a) the equitable distribution of benefits from payments for performance (REDD+ project), potentially increasing the net earnings by \$2 to 4 USD per tCO<sub>2</sub>-e/year); b) improving the skills of local community members (including women) by training them in the principles and practices of REDD+, SLM, and BD conservation; c) ecological rehabilitation activities (implementation of LMT in private lands) that will improve the characteristics of production systems (e.g., agroforestry and silvopastoral systems) and will increase income for the small- and medium-scale landowners; and d) the implementation of two community plant nurseries, from which peasant women can draw an important source of work and income. To ensure that the issues of gender are fully incorporated into the different project components, a gender specialist was contracted during the PPG phase to develop these topics. By protecting and improving forest cover and promoting more suitable land use practices to reduce erosion, the project will help to reduce the vulnerability of the local communities to natural disasters that are associated with the occurrence of extreme climatic events in deforested areas and degraded ecosystems.

25. The project's focus on local and regional PAs and/or conservation agreements will allow more flexibility in defining protection categories for the areas to be established, which will help to avoid conflicts related to local communities' use of and access to natural resources. Furthermore, PAs with IUCN classifications of VI or private reserves have been chosen as options for the project, since these PA types support the sustainable use of resources and the protection of related cultural values. These PA type choices will serve to reduce the risk for potential conflicts with local communities. These categories of PAs are recognized by the National System of Protected Areas of Colombia (SINAP). Furthermore, the project will serve to strengthen the capacities and participation of local communities with regard to PA planning and management and in implementing conservation agreements. The PAs may be directly managed by local communities with support from regional authorities, and conservation agreements will be established between local and regional authorities (municipalities and CARs) and individual or communal (e.g., indigenous communities and afro-Colombian communities) landowners. This could improve the local communities' appropriation of the territories, but it might even have a positive impact on the income levels of the communities, as a result of activities such as ecotourism and payment for environmental services, which will be promoted through the development of business plans designed to ensure the financial sustainability of these conservation initiatives.

### B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

26. The GEF strategy for promoting the sustainable use and conservation of BD in dry ecosystems to guarantee the flow of ecosystem services and to mitigate the deforestation and desertification processes in the Caribbean region and the IAVMR of Colombia will be more profitable in the short and long terms than the alternative approach, in which disperse and uncoordinated efforts will prevail, limited by their insufficiency in planning, management, and monitoring of actions projected as part of the baseline. Through the strengthening of the land use regulatory framework, the declaration of PAs, and the implementation of REDD+ and SLM activities, the GEF alternative will allow the overcoming of the barriers that currently prevent the reduction of deforestation and desertification in prioritized dry forest landscapes and the reduction of threats to the associated BD.

27. The cost-effectiveness will promote working with the existing institutions at the regional level (the CARs) that already have the organizational capacity and working relationships with local institutions (municipalities and communities) that will optimize time and available resources for implementing project activities. The declaration of PAs for the protection of the ecosystems will follow the conservation priorities already defined at the regional and local levels and will increase representativeness of protected dry ecosystem in the country. The REDD+ pilot project will employ principles and procedures that are being defined in the country within the ENREDD+ context in order for the project goals to directly support the national efforts to reduce deforestation. In this context, the REDD+ pilot project has been conceived with an Early Implementation Activity within ENREDD+ that will help to optimize the use of resources in the medium and long term in efforts to reduce tropical dry forest deforestation.

28. The return on investment will also include the avoided deforestation of 4.5% of the dry forested to be protected through the REDD+ pilot project during a 5-year period (21,447.4 ha), which otherwise would have been lost given that the alternate scenario does not consider effective mechanisms to reduce deforestation. In addition, the alternate scenario does not consider the development of strategies as part of land use planning to address threats to BD and to reduce soil degradation in the prioritized municipalities and to guarantee the flow of ecosystem services, including habitat for BD, reduction of GHG, stable carbon stocks, stabilized soils, and reduction of erosion, water regulation and storage, and improved quality of life for the local communities.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:**

29. Project M&E will be conducted in accordance with the established UNDP and GEF procedures and will be provided by the project team and the UNDP-CO with support from the UNDP/GEF RCU in Panama City. The Project Results Framework in Section 3 provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The M&E plan includes an inception report, project implementation reviews, quarterly and annual review reports, mid-term and final evaluations, and audits. The following sections outline the principle components of the M&E plan and indicative cost estimates related to M&E activities. The project's M&E plan will be presented and finalized in the Project Inception Report following a collective fine-tuning of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities.

#### ***Project Inception Phase***

30. A **Project Inception Workshop (IW)** will be held within the first three (3) months of project start-up with the full project team, relevant GoC counterparts, co-financing partners, the UNDP-CO, and representation from the UNDP-GEF RCU, as well as UNDP-GEF headquarters as appropriate.

31. A fundamental objective of this IW will be to help the project team to understand and take ownership of the project's goal and objectives, as well as finalize preparation of the project's first annual work plan on the basis of the Project Results Framework and GEF Tracking Tools (BD, LD, and SFM/REDD and UNDP's ESSP. This will include reviewing the results framework (indicators, means of verification, and assumptions), reviewing the appropriate next steps for environmental and social assessment and management, imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise, finalizing the AWP with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project.

32. Additionally, the purpose and objective of the IW will be to: a) introduce project staff to the UNDP-GEF team that will support the project during its implementation, namely the CO and responsible RCU staff; b) detail the roles, support services, and complementary responsibilities of UNDP-CO and RCU staff in relation to the project team; c) provide a detailed overview of UNDP-GEF reporting and M&E requirements, with particular emphasis on the Annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and related documentation, the Annual Project Report (APR), as well as Mid-term and Final evaluations. Equally, the IW will provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP project-related budgetary planning, budget reviews including arrangements for annual audit, and mandatory budget re-phrasings.

33. The IW will also provide an opportunity for all parties to understand their roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference (ToRs) for project staff and decision-making structures will be discussed, as needed, in order to clarify each party's responsibilities during the project's implementation phase. The IW will also be used to plan and schedule the Tripartite Committee Reviews.

#### ***Monitoring Responsibilities and Events***

34. A detailed schedule of project review meetings will be developed by the project management in consultation with project implementation partners and stakeholder representatives and incorporated in the Project Inception Report. Such a schedule will include: a) tentative timeframes for Tripartite Committee (TPC) Reviews, Steering Committee (or relevant advisory and/or coordination mechanisms); and b) project-related M&E activities.

35. **Day-to-day monitoring** of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the PC based on the project's AWP and its indicators. The PC will inform the UNDP-CO of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely and remedial fashion. The PC will fine-tune the progress and performance/impact indicators of the project in consultation with the full project team at the IW with support from UNDP-CO and assisted by the UNDP-GEF RCU. Specific targets for the first-year implementation progress indicators together with their means of verification will be developed at this workshop. These will be used to assess whether implementation is proceeding at the intended pace and in the right direction and will form part of the AWP. Targets and indicators for subsequent years will be defined annually as part of the internal evaluation and planning processes undertaken by the project team.

36. Measurement of impact indicators related to global benefits will occur according to the schedules defined through specific studies that are to form part of the project's activities and specified in the Project Results Framework.



37. **Periodic monitoring** of implementation progress will be undertaken by the UNDP CO through quarterly meetings with the project implementation team, or more frequently as deemed necessary. This will allow parties to take stock of and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure the timely implementation of project activities. The UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF RCU, as appropriate, will conduct yearly visits to the project's field sites, or more often based on an agreed upon schedule to be detailed in the project's Inception Report and AWP to assess first-hand project progress. Any other member of the Steering Committee can also take part in these trips, as decided by the Steering Committee. A Field Visit Report will be prepared by the UNDP CO and circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team, all Steering Committee members, and UNDP-GEF.

38. **Annual monitoring** will occur through the Tripartite Committee (TPC) Reviews. This is the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. The project will be subject to TPC review at least once every year. The first such meeting will be held within the first twelve (12) months of the start of full implementation. The project proponent will prepare an APR and submit it to UNDP CO and the UNDP-GEF regional office at least two weeks prior to the TPC for review and comments.

39. The APR will be used as one of the basic documents for discussions in the TPC. The PC will present the APR to the TPC, highlighting policy issues and recommendations for the decision of the TPC participants. The PC will also inform the participants of any agreement reached by stakeholders during the APR preparation on how to resolve operational issues. Separate reviews of each project component may also be conducted if necessary. The TPC has the authority to suspend disbursement if project performance benchmarks are not met. Benchmarks will be developed at the IW, based on delivery rates and qualitative assessments of achievements of outputs.

40. The **Terminal TPC Review** is held in the last month of project operations. The PC is responsible for preparing the Terminal Report and submitting it to UNDP-CO and to UNDP-GEF RCU. It shall be prepared in draft at least two months in advance of the TPC meeting in order to allow review, and will serve as the basis for discussions in the TPC meeting. The terminal TPC review considers the implementation of the project as a whole, paying particular attention to whether the project has achieved its stated objectives and contributed to the broader environmental objective. It decides whether any actions are still necessary, particularly in relation to sustainability of project results, and acts as a vehicle through which lessons learned can be captured to feed into other projects being implemented.

### ***Project Monitoring Reporting***

41. The PC, in conjunction with the UNDP-GEF extended team, will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports that form part of the monitoring process and that are mandatory.

42. A **Project Inception Report (IR)** will be prepared immediately following the IW. It will include a detailed First Year/AWP divided in quarterly timeframes detailing the activities and progress indicators that will guide implementation during the first year of the project. This work plan will include the dates of specific field visits, support missions from the UNDP CO or the RCU or consultants, as well as timeframes for meetings of the project's decision-making structures. The IR will also include the detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation, prepared on the basis of the AWP, and including any M&E requirements to effectively measure project performance during the targeted 12-month timeframe. The IR will include a more detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions, and feedback mechanisms of project-related partners. In addition, a section will be included on progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation. When finalized, the IR will be circulated to project counterparts who will be given a period of one calendar month in which to respond with comments or queries. Prior to the IR's circulation, the UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF's RCU will review the document.

43. The **Annual Project Report (APR)** is a UNDP requirement and part of UNDP CO central oversight, monitoring, and project management. It is a self-assessment report by the project management to the CO and provides input to the country office reporting process and the Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR), as well as forming a key input to the TPC Review. An APR will be prepared on an annual basis prior to the TPC review, to reflect progress achieved in meeting the project's AWP and assess performance of the project in contributing to intended outcomes through outputs and partnership work. The format of the APR is flexible but should include the following sections: a) project risks, issues, and adaptive management; b) project progress against pre-defined indicators and targets, c) outcome performance; and d) lessons learned and best practices.

44. The **Project Implementation Review** (PIR) is an annual monitoring process mandated by the GEF. It has become an essential management and monitoring tool for project managers and offers the main vehicle for extracting lessons from ongoing projects. Once the project has been under implementation for one year, a PIR must be completed by the CO together with the project management. The PIR can be prepared any time during the year and ideally prior to the TPC review. The PIR should then be discussed in the TPC meeting so that the result would be a PIR that has been agreed upon by the project, the Implementing Partner, UNDP CO, and the RCU in Panama. The individual PIRs are collected, reviewed, and analyzed by the RCU prior to sending them to the focal area clusters at the UNDP-GEF headquarters. In light of the similarities of both APR and PIR, UNDP-GEF has prepared a harmonized format for reference.

45. **Quarterly Progress Reports** outlining main updates in project progress will be provided quarterly to the local UNDP CO and the UNDP-GEF RCU by the project team. Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform and the risk log should be regularly updated in ATLAS based on the initial risk analysis included in Annex 8.1.

46. **Specific Thematic Reports** focusing on specific issues or areas of activity will be prepared by the project team when requested by UNDP, UNDP-GEF, or the Implementing Partner. The request for a Thematic Report will be provided to the project team in written form by UNDP and will clearly state the issue or activities that need to be reported on. These reports can be used as a form of lessons learned exercise, specific oversight in key areas, or as troubleshooting exercises to evaluate and overcome obstacles and difficulties encountered. UNDP is requested to minimize its requests for Thematic Reports, and when such are necessary will allow reasonable timeframes for their preparation by the project team.

47. A **Project Terminal Report** will be prepared by the project team during the last three (3) months of the project. This comprehensive report will summarize all activities, achievements, and outputs of the project; lessons learned; objectives met or not achieved; structures and systems implemented, etc.; and will be the definitive statement of the project's activities during its lifetime. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's activities.

48. **Technical Reports** are detailed documents covering specific areas of analysis or scientific specializations within the overall project. As part of the Inception Report, the project team will prepare a draft Reports List detailing the technical reports that are expected to be prepared on key areas of activity during the course of the project, and tentative due dates. Where necessary this Reports List will be revised and updated, and included in subsequent APRs. Technical Reports may also be prepared by external consultants and should be comprehensive and specialized analyses of clearly defined areas of research within the framework of the project and its sites. These technical reports will represent, as appropriate, the project's substantive contribution to specific areas, and will be used in efforts to disseminate relevant information and best practices at local, national, and international levels. Technical Reports have a broader function and the frequency and nature is project-specific.

49. **Project Publications** will form a key method of crystallizing and disseminating the results and achievements of the project. These publications may be scientific or informational texts on the activities and achievements of the project in the form of journal articles or multimedia publications. These publications can be based on Technical Reports, depending upon the relevance and scientific worth of these reports, or may be summaries or compilations of a series of Technical Reports and other research. The project team will determine if any of the Technical Reports merit formal publication, and (in consultation with UNDP, the GoC, and other relevant stakeholder groups) will also plan and produce these publications in a consistent and recognizable format. Project resources will need to be defined and allocated for these activities as appropriate and in a manner commensurate with the project's budget.

### ***Independent Evaluation***

50. The project will be subjected to at least two independent external evaluations as follows:

51. An independent **Mid-Term Evaluation** will be undertaken at exactly the mid-point of the project lifetime. The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency, and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation, and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, ToRs, and timing of the mid-term

evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The ToRs for this Mid-Term Evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP-CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF RCU. The management response of the evaluation will be uploaded to the UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). All GEF Tracking Tools for the project will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

52. An independent **Final Evaluation** will take place three months prior to the terminal Steering Committee meeting, and will focus on the same issues as the Mid-Term Evaluation. The Final Evaluation will also look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. The Final Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP ERC. The ToRs for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP-CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF RCU. All GEF Tracking Tools for the project will also be completed during the final evaluation.

#### **Audits**

53. The project will be audited in accordance with the UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies.

#### **Learning and Knowledge Sharing**

54. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through a number of existing information sharing networks and forums. In addition, the project will participate, as relevant and appropriate, in UNDP-GEF sponsored networks, organized for Senior Personnel working on projects that share common characteristics. UNDP-GEF RCU has established an electronic platform for sharing lessons between the project managers. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based, and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Identify and analyzing lessons learned is an ongoing process, and the need to communicate such lessons as one of the project's central contributions is a requirement to be delivered not less frequently than once every twelve (12) months. UNDP-GEF shall provide a format and assist the project team in categorizing, documenting, and reporting on lessons learned.

#### **M&E work plan and budget**

<b>Type of M&amp;E activity</b>	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>Budget US\$*</b>	<b>Time frame</b>
Inception Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Coordinator</li> <li>• UNDP CO</li> <li>• UNDP GEF</li> </ul>	4,000 (GEF) 2,000 (CoF)	Within first two months of project start-up
Inception Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP CO</li> </ul>	None	Immediately following IW
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP GEF Regional Technical Advisor/Project Coordinator will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members</li> </ul>	To be determined during the initial phase of implementation of the project and the IW.	Start, mid-point, and end of project
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oversight by Project Coordinator</li> <li>• Project Team</li> </ul>	No separate M&E cost: to be absorbed within salary and travel costs of project staff	Annually prior to APR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
APR and PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Coordinator and Team</li> <li>• UNDP-CO</li> <li>• UNDP-GEF</li> </ul>	None	Annually
Tripartite Committee Reviews and Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GoC counterparts</li> <li>• UNDP CO</li> <li>• UNDP GEF RCU</li> </ul>	None	Annually, upon receipt of APR

Steering Committee/Board Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Coordinator</li> <li>• UNCP-CO</li> <li>• GoC representatives</li> </ul>	2,500 (GEF) 4,000 (CoF) (1,300 per year)	Two times per year
Quarterly progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Coordinator and Team</li> </ul>	None	Quarterly
Technical reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Coordinator and Team</li> <li>• Hired consultants as needed</li> </ul>	5,000 (GEF) 4,000 (CoF)	To be determined by Project Team and UNDP-CO
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Coordinator and Team</li> <li>• UNDP- CO</li> <li>• UNDP-GEF RCU</li> <li>• External Consultants (i.e., evaluation team)</li> </ul>	44,000 (GEF) 20,000 (CoF)	At the mid-point of project implementation
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Coordinator and Team</li> <li>• UNDP- CO</li> <li>• UNDP-GEF RCU</li> <li>• External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</li> </ul>	54,500 (GEF) 25,000 (CoF)	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Team</li> <li>• UNDP-CO</li> </ul>	2,500 (GEF) 2,000 (CoF)	At least three months before the end of the project
Lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Coordinator and Team</li> <li>• UNDP-GEF RCU (suggested formats for documenting best practices, etc.)</li> </ul>	7,500 (GEF) 4,000 (CoF) (2,300 per year)	Yearly
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP-CO</li> <li>• Project Coordinator and Team</li> <li>• Auditors</li> </ul>	44,000 (GEF) (8,800 per year)	Yearly
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNDP-CO</li> <li>• UNDP-GEF RCU (as appropriate)</li> <li>• GoC representatives</li> </ul>	No separate M&E cost: paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
<b>TOTAL INDICATIVE COST</b> (*Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses)		GEF	164,000
		CoF	61,000


**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):**  
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Adriana Soto Carreño	Vice Minister	Environment and Sustainable Development	NOVEMBER 30, 2011

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Officer-in-Charge and Deputy Executive Coordinator		October 11, 2013	Santiago Carrizosa, Regional Technical Advisor, EBD	+507 302- 4510	<a href="mailto:Santiago.carrizosa@undp.org">Santiago.carrizosa@undp.org</a>

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Project Strategy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators				
	Indicator	Baseline	Goal (of the Indicator)	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions
<p><b>Project Objective:</b> To reduce the current trend of dry forest deforestation and desertification processes and ensure the flow of multiple global ecosystem services through biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, and carbon storage.</p>	<p>Coverage (ha) of dry forest and other dry ecosystems in PAs and/or conservation agreements.</p>	<p>– 1,370,496 ha</p>	<p>– 1,388,496 ha</p>	<p>– Maps/GIS – Field studies/notes – Project evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations</p>	<p>– Interest is maintained by the GoC (national, regional, and local), local stakeholders (communities and landowners) to create new PAs or adopt conservation agreements that include dry forest – Environmental variability/vulnerability (including climate change) within the normal ranges – There are so substantial changes in land use/land cover</p>
	<p>Number of key species by biological groups (birds, plants, and ants) in permanent monitoring plots in the prioritized sites</p>	<p>– Caribbean region: ○ Birds: 6 ○ Plants: 8 (trees) ○ Ants: 2 – IAVMR: ○ Birds:3 ○ Plants: 5 (trees) ○ Ants: 2</p> <p>Species will be selected among the lists provided in Table 13 of this Project Document</p>	<p>– Caribbean region: ○ Birds: 6 ○ Plants: 8 (trees) ○ Ants: 2 – IAVMR: ○ Birds:3 ○ Plants: 5 (trees) ○ Ants: 2</p>	<p>– Project monitoring reports/ databases – Results from Rapid Ecological Assessments – Biological censuses and field notes</p>	<p>– Monitoring efforts are optimal – Environmental variability is within the normal range</p>
	<p>Number of identified carbon units for the carbon market at the end of the project</p>	<p>– 0</p>	<p>– 93,700 tCO<sub>2</sub>-e</p>	<p>– Carbon units identification reports – Project evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations</p>	<p>– Conditions exist for implementing REDD+</p>

<b>Component 1:</b> Strengthened implementation of the regulatory and land use planning framework facilitates the reduction of dry ecosystem deforestation and desertification processes.	Number of local plans that incorporate BD conservation, SLM, and SFM strategies	– POTs: 0 – PDMs: 0	– POTs: 6 – PDMs: 6	– Drafts and published local plans	– There is willingness by the decision-makers to incorporate elements of BD conservation, SLM, and REDD+ development into local planning tools – There is legal feasibility																																																																																			
	Number of professionals and technical staff from the CARs, MADS, IDEAM, and land use agencies designing and implementing SLM, REDD+, and BD conservation strategies	– IDEAM: 5 – MADS: 3 – CARs: 37 – Municipalities: 6 – Departmental governments: 13	– IDEAM: 10 – MADS: 10 – CARs: 87 – Municipalities: 18 – Departmental governments: 20	– Project evaluation reports – Minutes from training sessions – Databases with records of trainees	– National, regional, and municipal technical staff apply their new knowledge and skills appropriately – There is stability in human resources of the institutions that benefit from the training activities – Sampling efforts are optimal																																																																																			
	Change in the institutional capacity of the CARs according to the UNDP's Capacity Development Scorecard: a. Capacities for engagement b. Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge c. Capacities for policy and legislation development d. Capacities for management and implementation e. Capacities to monitor and evaluate	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Corpogujira</th> <th>Corpoesar</th> <th>Cortolima</th> <th>CAM</th> <th>CVC</th> <th></th> <th>Corpogujira</th> <th>Corpoesar</th> <th>Cortolima</th> <th>CAM</th> <th>CVC</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a.</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>2.3</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>a.</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>1.6</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>2.9</td> <td>2.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b.</td> <td>1.8</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>1.6</td> <td>1.6</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>b.</td> <td>2.4</td> <td>1.8</td> <td>2.2</td> <td>2.2</td> <td>1.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c.</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>1.3</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>c.</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>1.9</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>2.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d.</td> <td>1.5</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>d.</td> <td>2.1</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>2.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e.</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>e.</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>0.6</td> <td>1.1</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>3.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="6"></td> <td colspan="6">Increase by 20% or 0.6 points (3.0 is the highest score possible)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Corpogujira	Corpoesar	Cortolima	CAM	CVC		Corpogujira	Corpoesar	Cortolima	CAM	CVC	a.	2.0	1.0	2.6	2.3	2.0	a.	2.6	1.6	3.0	2.9	2.6	b.	1.8	1.2	1.6	1.6	1.2	b.	2.4	1.8	2.2	2.2	1.8	c.	2.6	1.3	2.0	2.6	2.0	c.	3.0	1.9	2.6	3.0	2.6	d.	1.5	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	d.	2.1	0.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	e.	3.0	0.0	0.5	2.5	2.5	e.	3.0	0.6	1.1	3.0	3.0							Increase by 20% or 0.6 points (3.0 is the highest score possible)							
	Corpogujira	Corpoesar	Cortolima	CAM	CVC		Corpogujira	Corpoesar	Cortolima	CAM	CVC																																																																													
a.	2.0	1.0	2.6	2.3	2.0	a.	2.6	1.6	3.0	2.9	2.6																																																																													
b.	1.8	1.2	1.6	1.6	1.2	b.	2.4	1.8	2.2	2.2	1.8																																																																													
c.	2.6	1.3	2.0	2.6	2.0	c.	3.0	1.9	2.6	3.0	2.6																																																																													
d.	1.5	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	d.	2.1	0.6	2.6	2.6	2.6																																																																													
e.	3.0	0.0	0.5	2.5	2.5	e.	3.0	0.6	1.1	3.0	3.0																																																																													
						Increase by 20% or 0.6 points (3.0 is the highest score possible)																																																																																		
<b>Outputs:</b>																																																																																								
1.1. Six (6) land use zoning plans (POTs) effectively contribute to the reduction of dry forest deforestation and degradation. 1.2. Capacity-building program directed to at least 80 regional and technical government officials and 20 social and grassroots organizations in BD conservation, SLM, and REDD+, and their articulation with local planning tools with a focus in gender and with cultural relevance. 1.3. Regional geographic information systems (GIS) guide the local-level planning processes (POT and PDM) in BD conservation, SLM, and SFM, and are integrated into the national systems. 1.4. Measurement, Reporting, and Verification (MRV) protocols for monitoring deforestation in dry forests are applied, and articulated with municipal and regional territorial planning instruments (e.g., POT, POMCA, MDP, POF, etc.) to assess REDD+ benefits.																																																																																								

<p><b>Component 2:</b> Delivery of multiple global environmental benefits through the declaration of PAs and/or conservation agreements, REDD+ practices, and SLM activities that strengthen the conservation and sustainable use of dry forests.</p>	<p>Number of PAs and/or conservation agreements that include dry ecosystems nation wide</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PAs: 25</li> <li>- Conservation agreements: 0*</li> </ul> <p>* To be confirmed during the first year of project execution</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PAs: Up to 37</li> <li>- Conservation agreements: Up to 12</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposals for declaration of new PAs</li> <li>- Single National Registry of Protected Areas (RUNAP)</li> <li>- Agreements by the Advisory Boards of the 6 participating CARs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is willingness among the decision-makers to create new PAs that include dry ecosystems</li> <li>- Consensus among the local stakeholders (municipalities and communities) to establish new PAs</li> </ul>
	<p>Change in the management effectiveness of three (3) PAs with dry ecosystems as measured by the METT scorecard</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IMD Atuncela: 49.02%</li> <li>- Los Besotes Wildlife Sanctuary: 38.24%</li> <li>- PFR Los Ceibotes: 35.29%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IMD Atuncela: 59.02%</li> <li>- Los Besotes Wildlife Sanctuary: 48.24%</li> <li>- PFR Los Ceibotes: 45.29%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tracking tool (METT scorecards) updated</li> <li>- Project evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interest is maintained by the GoC (national, regional, and local), local stakeholders (communities and landowners) to improve management of the PAs</li> </ul>
	<p>Change in the financial capacity for the management of PAs with dry ecosystems according to that established through the total average score in the Financial Sustainability Scorecard (tracking tool)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks: 26.32%</li> <li>- Business planning and tools for cost-effective management: 36%</li> <li>- Tools for revenue generation by PAs: 25%</li> <li>- Total: 28.44%</li> </ul> <p>Note: baseline and target will be confirmed during the first year of project implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks: 36.32%</li> <li>- Business planning and tools for cost-effective management: 46%</li> <li>- Tools for revenue generation by PAs: 35%</li> <li>- Total: 38.44%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Financial Sustainability Scorecard (tracking tool) updated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interest from environmental GoC (national and regional) and other stakeholders to improve the financial sustainability of PAs with the presence of dry ecosystems</li> </ul>
	<p>Area (ha) of dry forest under REDD+ activities at the end of the project</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 21,447.4 ha</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reports from the carbon flow monitoring system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conditions exist for implementing REDD+</li> <li>- Monitoring efforts are optimal</li> </ul>
	<p>Reduction of emissions (tCO<sub>2</sub>-e) (areal biomass) through avoided deforestation at the end of the project</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Garupal River watershed: 50,587 tCO<sub>2</sub>-e*</li> <li>- Dagua River watershed: 43,113 tCO<sub>2</sub>-e*</li> </ul> <p>* Calculations will be verified during the first year of project execution</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tracking tool for SFM/REDD+-2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environmental variability is within the normal range, including climate change</li> </ul>
	<p>Reduction of emissions (tCO<sub>2</sub>-e) (below ground biomass) through avoided</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 0</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Garupal River watershed: X tCO<sub>2</sub>-e*</li> <li>- Dagua River watershed: X</li> </ul>		



	deforestation at the end of the project		tCO <sub>2</sub> -e* * Will be estimated during the first year of project execution	
	Avoided deforestation (ha) at the end of the project	- 0	- Garupal River watershed: 522.65 ha - Dagua River watershed: 445.42 ha	
	Flow contributed (m <sup>3</sup> /s) by the hydrological response unit (HRU) in each prioritized watershed	- Cañas River: 12 m <sup>3</sup> /s (dry season) - Garupal River: 0.53 m <sup>3</sup> /s (dry season) - Arroyo Grande: No data available* - Aipe River: 3.1 m <sup>3</sup> /s (dry season) - Yaví Stream: 2.42 m <sup>3</sup> /s (dry season). - Dagua River: 12.9 m <sup>3</sup> /s (upper section, dry season)  * Will be estimated during the first year of project execution  Note: The data sources are included in the footnote at the bottom of the page. <sup>5</sup>	- Cañas River: 12 m <sup>3</sup> /s (dry season) - Garupal River: 0.53 m <sup>3</sup> /s (dry season) - Arroyo Grande: No data available* - Aipe River: 3.1 m <sup>3</sup> /s (dry season) - Yaví River: 2.42 m <sup>3</sup> /s (dry season). - Dagua River: 12.9 m <sup>3</sup> /s (upper section, dry season)  * Will be estimated during the first year of project execution	- Hydrological monitoring reports/databases - Project evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations
	Sediments (Total Suspended Solids - TSS) contributed by the HRU in each prioritized watershed.	- Cañas River: 222 t/ha/year - Garupal River: No data available* - Arroyo Grande: No data available* - Aipe River: 10.5 t/ha/year - Yaví River: 100 t/ha/year - Dagua River: 200 t/ha/year  * Will be estimated during the first year of project execution  Note: The baseline information	- Cañas River: 176.6 t/ha/year - Garupal River: No data available* - Arroyo Grande: No data available* - Aipe River: 8.4 t/ha/year - Yaví River: 80 t/ha/year - Dagua River: 160 t/ha/year  * Will be estimated during the first year of project execution	

<sup>5</sup> Sources of flows for the prioritized watersheds: a) Garupal River: CORPOCESAR Resolution No. 1469, December 2012 “Por medio de la cual se otorga una concesión de aguas en la cuenca del río Garupal”; b) Cañas River: CORPOGUAJIRA Resolution No. 01094, May 20, 2011. “Por la cual se reglamenta la corriente de uso público denominada Río Cañas y sus afluentes”; c) Yaví River and Aipe River: ENA (IDEAM, 2010); and d) Dagua River: CVC 2007. Plan de ordenamiento y manejo de la cuenca hidrográfica del río Dagua - Informe diagnóstico.

		was obtained from the National Water Study (ENA: IDEAM, 2010).			
	Area (ha) of dry ecosystems restored	- 0	- 1,000 ha	- Field verification reports - Project evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations	- There is willingness by the private landowners to incorporate SLM and SFM practices as part of their production strategies

- Outputs:
- 2.1. Up to 12 PAs and/or conservation agreements established or designated at the local and regional levels, in the Caribbean region and the Inter-Andean Valley of the Magdalena River to ensure the flow of multiple global ecosystem services.
  - 2.2. Participatory monitoring, surveillance, and enforcement mechanisms in place for 12 PAs and/or conservation agreements and supported by management plans and financial resources derived from government funds (i.e., CARs) and other sources.
  - 2.3. Technical, financial, social, and institutional information to assess the feasibility of developing REDD+ projects in 21,447.4 ha of dry forest (3,629.6 ha in the Caribbean region and 17,817.8 ha in the Inter-Andean Magdalena River Valley) and contributes to regional sustainability through maintenance of ecosystem services.
  - 2.4. Roadmap for REDD+ initiative in the dry forest defined.
  - 2.5. Monitoring system allows follow-up on global benefits from BD conservation, SLM, and REDD+ with emphasis on the projects prioritized sites and articulated with the national monitoring systems.
  - 2.6. Landscape management tools (e.g., silvopastoral systems, hedgerows, biological corridors, etc.), sustain water flows, and reduce land degradation/desertification processes for 6 watersheds (3 in the Caribbean region and 3 in the Inter-Andean Valley of the Magdalena River) implemented and included in land use and environmental plans.
  - 2.7. Local agreements for establishing landscape management tools (i.e., biological corridors, hedgerows, windbreaks, etc.), that maintain the forest cover (up to 1,000 ha) in sustainable production systems (silvopastoral systems, PES, agroforestry, etc.).
  - 2.8. Up to six (6) ecological rehabilitation pilot projects (using native species) for dry forests in place to facilitate connectivity between these forests and buffer zones of three (3) PAs.

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Reviewer's comments	Responses	Reference
<b>Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion, January 09, 2012.</b>		
<p>1. Please clarify 1) how communities will be impacted by restrictions on resource uses in the PAs and 2) how the project will manage/mitigate these from a socio-economic perspective.</p>	<p>The protected areas (PAs) to be established by the project are regional PAs and private PAs that have limited restrictions on resource use. Regional PAs are IUCN Category VI (PAs with sustainable use of natural resources), for conservation of ecosystems and habitats associated with cultural values and traditional natural resource management systems. The project will facilitate the development of participatory management plans for these PAs, which will include monitoring and surveillance mechanisms developed jointly with local communities who will participate actively in their implementation. A REDD+ pilot project will act as an incentive to adopt best practices in selected sites and will eventually generate performance-based payments to compensate for restrictions on resource use if such is the case. Similarly, as part of the REDD+ activities, performance-based payments will compensate landowners who decide to establish private reserves on their lands. Management plans will be developed for private reserves for effective land planning and the implementation of sustainable production practices (agroforestry and silvopastoral systems) that eventually will generate income for the landowners who adopt these resource use strategies. Additionally, the project will support the development of business plans for private reserves to generate additional income through mechanisms such as payment for ecosystem services (PES) and ecotourism.</p>	<p>– Project Document Strategy: Project objectives, outcomes, and outputs/activities</p>
<p>2. Given that the dry forest is heavily degraded and fragmented (e.g. in the Cauca River valley) at CEO Endorsement please address the climate resilience of these remnants and their longer-term viability: Climate resilience of remnant dry forests and longer term viability.</p>	<p>The project will increase landscape connectivity (structural and functional) between dry forest patches in selected watersheds that will enhance their resilience to climate. This will be done establishing connectivity corridors and developing ecological rehabilitation activities (using native climate-resilient species) in 1,000 ha of productive lands and buffer areas of selected PAs. The selection of sites was made using a spatial analysis to identify the areas with the highest potential for connectivity. This includes private lands, where the implementation of agroforestry and silvopastoral systems and best management practices will contribute to the permanence of forest patches. Agroforestry and silvopastoral systems will promote the use of climate-resilient species (e.g., <i>Leucaena leucocephala</i>) in order to generate income for the landowners, providing an incentive to maintain forested areas and as a consequence the long-term viability of enhanced ecological connectivity and the expected increase in climate resilience.</p>	<p>– Project Document Strategy: Project objectives, outcomes, and outputs/activities</p>
<p>3. The issue of land tenure and rights is noted and clear indication of how this is being addressed will be expected at CEO Endorsement and</p>	<p>The issue of land tenure and rights will be of particular interest in the context of the proposed REDD+ pilot project; the project's proponents will need to demonstrate that they have land ownership and rights</p>	<p>– Project Document Strategy: Project objectives, outcomes, and outputs/activities. An</p>

<p>REDD benefit sharing mechanism.</p>	<p>of the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in order to receive the benefits. Consultations with parties interested in implementing REDD+ activities were initiated during the PPG phase and included local workshops with members of afro-Colombian communities. For the implementation of REDD+ activities and benefit-sharing, the project will consider the collective rights of these communities to the land and natural resources. The full-sized GEF project was presented to the local communities in the two prioritized watersheds, including four community councils of afro-Colombians in the Garupal River watershed (municipality of Valledupar) and the communities of the Dagua municipality. Documentation of these consultations is included in Annex 8.10 of the Project Document. However, it is necessary to provide further information regarding REDD+, its use, and the related challenges and opportunities, how the different stakeholders can participate, as well as their rights, including land tenure rights, and responsibilities. This consultation process will continue during project implementation. Additionally, the technical, financial, social, and institutional feasibility of a REDD+ project will be determined as part of project implementation. The social feasibility analysis will serve to determine the positive and negative impacts of the REDD+ project on the communities living in the prioritized watersheds. Particular attention will be given to: a) a detailed analysis of tenure and the land and forests; b) alternatives and compensation/mitigation mechanisms that may be required as a result of the REDD+ project and which may include restrictions on the use of the forests and their associated resources; c) a detailed analysis of co-benefits, including improved ecosystem services; and d) the equitable distribution of benefits, including consideration of gender and cultural differences.</p>	<p>8.10.</p>
<p><b>GEF Intersessional Work Program: Comments from Council Members (Reference GEF GEF/IS/25), February 2012</b></p>		
<p><u><b>Canada Comments</b></u></p>		
<p>1. All of the biodiversity projects being proposed should provide information on how they relate to the country's obligations to the CBD, particularly the Aichi Targets. As presented, the PIFs is not clear on how it will help the country meet the Aichi targets. The project proponents should provide this information in the final project proposals.</p>	<p>The project will help Colombia to meet the following Aichi targets:  <b>Strategic Goal A: Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society</b>  <b>Target 1:</b> By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.  <b>Target 2:</b> By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.  <b>Strategic Goal B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use</b>  <b>Target 5:</b> By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural</p>	<p>- CEO Endorsement Request: Part II: Project justification; A.1 National strategies and plans.</p>

	<p>habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced.</p> <p><b>Target 7:</b> By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture, and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.</p> <p><b>Strategic Goal C: Improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity</b></p> <p><b>Target 11:</b> By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascapes.</p> <p><b>Target 12:</b> By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained</p> <p><b>Strategic Goal D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services</b></p> <p><b>Target 14:</b> By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.</p> <p><b>Target 15:</b> By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.</p> <p><b>Strategic Goal E: Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building</b></p> <p><b>Target 19:</b> By 2020, knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied.</p>	
<b><u>Switzerland Comments</u></b>		
<p>1. The project addresses different stresses for keeping and sustainably managing dry forest in the Atlantic Region of Colombia. It is especially interesting how the proposal links SMF/SLM with reduced decertification, biodiversity conservation and mitigation of climate change (through REDD+). This is seen as a major strength of this proposal.</p>	<p>Provision is made in the final design (Project Document) for the exchange of lessons learned and knowledge outside of Colombia. In particular, it was mentioned that Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua will implement initiatives to reduce desertification through SFM/SLM activities, and in the case of Guatemala, include REDD+ activities. Lessons learned and knowledge-sharing activities were included as part of the project’s monitoring and evaluation plan and have been properly budgeted.</p>	<p>– Project Document: Section 2 – Strategy, 2.9. Replicability</p>

<p>Although this level of complexity is challenging, major lessons can be learned, not only for Colombia, but also for other countries. Thus UNDP, as the GEF agency responsible for this project, should secure knowledge transfer beyond the partner country.</p>		
<p>2. The proposal seems to be based on a sound background of technical and natural science related issues. However, the social dynamic in the regions and its impacts on landscape use is not so well documented. This is perceived as a weakness that can jeopardize the long-term sustainability of the activities of the project.</p>	<p>The final design of the project includes socioeconomic information about the two regions where the project will be implemented (the Caribbean region and the Inter-Andean Valley of the Magdalena River [IAVMR]), as well as specific background socioeconomic information related to the municipalities that have been prioritized by the project (3 in the Caribbean region and the IAVMR). This information, together with local consultations with key stakeholders and social evaluations which include the participation of women in the project, was used to design the final project strategy and will contribute to the long-term sustainability of the project's activities. A total of 24 local organizations (community advisory boards, community organizations, and local NGOs) were consulted about their interest in the project and their expectations. This included seven women's organizations in four of the six watersheds prioritized for the implementation of specific project actions.</p> <p>Additionally, the full-sized GEF project was presented to the local communities in the two prioritized watersheds where a REDD+ project will be implemented, including four community councils of afro-Colombians in the Garupal River watershed (municipality of Valledupar) and the communities of the Dagua municipality. Further information regarding REDD+, its use, and the related challenges and opportunities, how the different stakeholders can participate, as well as their rights, including land tenure rights, and responsibilities will be provided during project implementation and will provide specific information regarding the social dynamics in the two prioritized sites.</p> <p>Consultations with local communities and additional social information gathered will be closely monitored as part of the UNDP's Environmental and Social Screening Procedure (ESSP), which allows preventing and mitigating undue harm to the environment and people that may arise through UNDP projects, as well strengthening UNDP's accountability and transparency.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CEO Endorsement Request: Part II, B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation; and Annex A: Project Results Framework</li> <li>- Project Document: 1. Situation analysis (1.1. Context and global significance; 2. Strategy: Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities</li> </ul>
<p>3. Social drivers and underlying drivers of resource degradation should be included in the analysis and corresponding activities aimed at addressing the most important drivers should be defined</p>	<p>Social drivers and underlying drivers of resource degradation were identified and included as part of the analysis of threats to biodiversity, land degradation and deforestation impacts, and their root causes. Underlying drivers of resource degradation include the expansion of agriculture and cattle ranching, the displacement of populations, weak land use planning processes, and the lack of institutional support for planning and natural resource use, among others.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project Document: 1. Situation analysis (1.1. Context and global significance; 2. Strategy: Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities</li> </ul>

	Project activities were designed to reduce the impact (biodiversity [BD] loss, soil degradation, deforestation) that is brought about as a consequence of these processes, some of which are so complex that their solutions are beyond the scope of this project.	
4. Colombia has set environmental friendly legislation for at least 30 years. The CARs, regional authorities in charge i.a. of environmental issues were created in the 80s. In the document it is stated that environmental-friendly legislation has not been implemented at the regional level. It would be important to clarify why, and how the project will address these deficits.	The project will only focus on the implementation of the regulatory and land use planning framework for the reduction of deforestation and desertification. More specifically, actions will be directed to comply with the directives of the National Action Plan to Combat Desertification and Drought (PAN) regarding the inclusion of dry forest in the land use planning processes of the prioritized municipalities, and thereby reducing desertification and drought in areas containing this ecosystem. The CARs, jointly with the MADS, will support this process.	– Project Document: 2. Strategy: Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities
5. For securing long-term feasibility it will be important to integrate an economic dimension in the project. In the proposal only payments (or transfers) from REDD+ are considered. Besides the fact that modalities for payments for REDD+ have not yet been agreed within the UNFCCC, the potential for emission reductions and carbon enhancement in dry forest is reduced. It is recommended by this reviewer that the project proponents consider other economic activities that can be pursued when promoting sustainable management of natural resources. It would be good to consider non-timber forest products (NTFP), ecotourism, and Payments for Environmental Services. If so, local communities and local authorities will need to include considerations on skill development and entrepreneurship training.	<p>The project will implement landscape management tools (LMTs) including agroforestry and silvopastoral systems, among other activities, that in addition to generating environmental benefits associated with improved water regulation and reduced sedimentation in the targeted watersheds, will also generate increased income for the landowners or landholders who implement these systems. Additionally, and specifically for landowners willing to establish private reserves in their properties, the project will facilitate the development of business plans to generate additional income through mechanisms such as PES and ecotourism. These actions will contribute to the long-term feasibility of the project's outputs.</p> <p>As mentioned in the response to Comment No. 2 (Switzerland), the full-sized GEF project was presented to the local communities in the two prioritized watersheds where a REDD+ project will be implemented, and further consultations regarding REDD+ will continue during project implementation. This will include an economic and social feasibility analysis of a REDD+ project that will determine the following: a) the extent of the incentives from the potential sale of carbon credits in the voluntary market; b) the alternatives and compensation/mitigation mechanisms that may be required as a result of the REDD+ project that may include restrictions on the use of the forests and their associated resources; c) a detailed analysis of co-benefits, including improved ecosystem services; and d) the equitable distribution of benefits, including consideration of gender and cultural differences. These consultations and analyses will also be monitored as part of UNDP's ESSP.</p>	<p>– CEO Endorsement Request: Annex A: Project Results Framework</p> <p>– Project Document: 2. Strategy (2.4. Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities)</p>
<b>STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF), date of screening: January 25, 2012.</b>		
1. The baseline analysis for Land Degradation is, by comparison with those for biodiversity and SFM/REDD, somewhat thin and incomplete. Colombia has a modest record of research into soil erosion and land degradation but this does include	The baseline analysis for Land Degradation was updated with information developed by the Institute of Hydrology, Meteorology, and Environmental Studies of Colombia (IDEAM; 2010) and included in the document <i>Informe del estado del medio ambiente y los recursos naturales renovables 2010</i> (IAvH, IDEAM,	<p>– CEO Endorsement Request: Project Results Framework</p> <p>– Project Document: 1. Situation analysis (1.1. Context and global</p>

<p>some estimates of productivity decline consequent upon erosion – see <a href="http://www.tucson.ars.ag.gov/isco/isco12/VolumeII/ErosionandSoilProductivityRelationships.pdf">http://www.tucson.ars.ag.gov/isco/isco12/VolumeII/ErosionandSoilProductivityRelationships.pdf</a>. STAP urges the proponents to include some quantitative data so that the changes consequent on the project may be tracked. Even the use of simple soil loss and productivity change model estimates would provide valuable information</p>	<p>IIAP, INVEMAR, and SINCHI, 2011). IDEAM, in order to monitor soil and land degradation due to desertification, has been developing an information system about the state of desertification in the country. Based on new available soil and ecosystem data, IDEAM has been able to update information about the degradation of soils per department. This information has been included in the Project Document, including specific information for six prioritized watersheds (3 in the Caribbean region and 3 in the IAVMR).</p> <p>Finally, two quantitative indicators were included as part of the project’s results framework to track land degradation-related benefits: a) stable flow contributed (m<sup>3</sup>/s) by the hydrological response unit (HRU)* in each prioritized watershed; and b) change in sediments contributed (total suspended solids [TSS]) by the HRU in each prioritized watershed. The project will make use of the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT), to assess changes resulting from project implementation. The SWAT is a hydrological modeling program designed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in conjunction with the University of Texas that simulates the production of water and sediments in watersheds and the impacts that production activities have on the water quality.</p> <p>*The HRUs form homogeneous areas for which soil- and water-related calculations can be made on an individual basis. Based on the values obtained for the HRUs, the same parameters are calculated in the largest drainage areas where they are contained.</p>	<p>significance; 2. Strategy (2.4. Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities)</p>
<p>2. On component 1, UNDP may wish to consider adapting the Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA) methodology, or contacting FAO, for the development of methodologies to estimate soil erosion in the targeted areas (Output 1.2.1). <a href="http://www.fao.org/nr/lada/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=frontpage&amp;Itemid=75&amp;lang=en">http://www.fao.org/nr/lada/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=frontpage&amp;Itemid=75&amp;lang=en</a></p>	<p>As suggested, the adoption of the Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA) methodology was considered in Component 1. Local and regional stakeholders will be trained with support provided by the Ecosystems and Environmental Information Unit of the IDEAM in the use of methodologies, including LADA, for estimating soil loss and degradation resulting from unsustainable agricultural and cattle-ranching production practices. IDEAM’s staff is knowledgeable about the LADA methodology and will be instrumental in transferring this knowledge to the local level for estimating soil erosion in the target areas.</p>	<p>– Project Document: 2. Strategy: Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities (Component 1)</p>
<p>3. Given the wealth of information the project intends to generate on SLM and biodiversity in dry ecosystems, UNDP also could consider contributing to, or learning from, Colombia’s experience with piloting UNCCD’s impact indicators (land management and biodiversity are among UNCCD’s impact indicators). Colombia is one of eleven countries asked to pilot UNCCD’s impact indicators as a way to generate knowledge to better prepare countries for UNCCD’s reporting requirements in 2013. A report of Colombia’s</p>	<p>The project will provide information related to Indicator IX “Land Cover,” one of the two mandatory indicators of the UNCCD’s impact indicators*. More specifically, the project will provide information through the REDD+ planned activities that will monitor changes in land cover and land use in two dry forest landscapes.</p> <p>* Schulte- Herbrüggen, B., Mapendembe, A., Booth, H., Jaques, M. &amp; Smith, J. (2012). The UNCCD Impact Indicators Pilot Tracking Exercise: Results and Conclusions. UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge.</p>	<p>– Project Document: 2. Strategy: Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities</p>



<p>experience with piloting UNCCD indicators can be obtained at - <a href="http://impact-pilot.unccd.int/en/static_pages/about">http://impact-pilot.unccd.int/en/static_pages/about</a></p>		
<p>4. A minor comment – It is not clear what entity is CIPAV (Component 2).</p>	<p>CIPAV stands for the Center for Research on Sustainable Farming Systems (<i>Centro para la Investigación en Sistemas Sostenibles de Producción Agropecuaria</i>).</p>	<p>– Project Document: 2. Strategy: Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities</p>
<p>5. Ecological monitoring in one form or another is commendably included in both components – Outputs 1.2.2; 1.2.3; 2.1.2; 2.2.3. The GEF attaches considerable importance to the monitoring of the impact of projects, especially those such as this which claim multiple environmental benefits. It is unclear from the Key Stakeholder listing who will undertake which monitoring and, more importantly, how the overall beneficial impact of the project from the several sources of information (e.g. carbon storage, water flow, MRV protocols etc.) will be brought together on a common platform both for reporting and for learning</p>	<p>The project will use the existing infrastructure for environmental monitoring (hardware; software; personnel; protocols for sampling, analysis, and reporting; among other technical aspects) in each of the CARs (CORPOCESAR, CARDIQUE, CORPOGUAJIRA, CORTOLIMA, CAM, and CVC) with jurisdiction in the six prioritized project sites, and will make the necessary adjustments to each system to evaluate the project’s global environmental benefits. Project funds will be used to make adjustments and/or additions to the existing monitoring systems for BD, forests, and soils, and to define mechanisms for exchanging information between the CARs to optimize their management and use. The monitoring systems will be coordinated by the Project Implementation Unit (PIU), which is established by UNDP as the executing agency of the project, and in coordination with the CARs. The information generated will be made available to all of the project’s key stakeholders (MADS, IAvH, IDEAM, municipalities, community organizations, and landowners).</p>	<p>– CEO Endorsement Request: B. Additional Information not Addressed at PIF Stage, B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation</p> <p>– Project Document: 2. Strategy: Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities</p>
<p>6. It is encouraging the project intends to hire a gender specialist during the PPG phase. STAP, therefore, would expect for the project interventions to be disaggregated by gender in the full proposal. Gender targeted interventions are more likely to generate the expected socioeconomic benefits for women -which the proposal indicates briefly - as well as strengthen more effectively women's capacities as natural resource managers</p>	<p>A local consultation process was conducted by a gender expert to develop a participatory plan for women in the project, including their training needs and an initial assessment of their expectations regarding the project. Local workshops were held in five of the six municipalities where the projects will be implemented. This local consultation process helped to obtain information about the existence of women's organizations (there are seven organizations of women in four of the six basins prioritized) and the type of activities they are involved in with regard to natural resources and ecosystem management in dry lands, among other gender-related topics.</p> <p>For the implementation phase of the project, and based on the results of the consultation activities undertaken and some specific experiences identified regarding the participation of women in natural resource management in dry ecosystems, an action plan for mainstreaming gender into project activities was defined. This includes women's participation in activities such as local plan development, creation of PAs, implementation of SLM and REDD+ activities, and the monitoring phase of the project in order to evaluate the effectiveness of women's participation, including participation mechanisms, number of female participants and beneficiaries of the project, and barriers to participation and lessons learned.</p>	<p>– CEO Endorsement Request: Part II, B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation</p> <p>– Project Document: 2. Strategy: Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities</p>

<p>7. STAP encourages UNDP to rely on its climate change profile for Colombia to specify further how the project components will reinforce climate resilience. Colombia's climate change profile can be downloaded at - <a href="http://country-profiles.geog.ox.ac.uk/">http://country-profiles.geog.ox.ac.uk/</a></p>	<p>Thank you for your recommendation. Although the suggested Colombia's climate change profile was not specifically used for the final project design, the project will address climate resilience by enhancing landscape connectivity (structural and functional) between dry forest patches in selected watersheds. This will be achieved by establishing connectivity corridors and developing ecological rehabilitation activities (using native climate-resilient species) in 1,000 ha of productive lands and the buffer areas of selected PAs. It is expected that increased ecological connectivity will reduce the negative effects of climate change on BD.</p>	<p>- Project Document: 2. Strategy: Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities</p>
---	---	---

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement, October 08, 2013.**

<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p> <p>October 08, 2013</p> <p>Please provide some additional rational to the reduction of outputs for example land use zoning plans, watershed management plans and REDD+ pilot projects. The main reason provided is reduced cofinance levels. If this is the case a commensurate reduction in GEF grant would be expected unless justification of the concentrated GEF investment is provided.</p>	<p>While a reduction in co-financing determined a reduction in the scope of the outputs as noted in Part II/A.5 of the CEO Endorsement Request, this reduction was underpinned by a technical assessment developed during the project preparation phase (PPG). During the PPG a detailed analysis (with the participation of the Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development, the Alexander von Humboldt Institute for Research on Biological Resources, and the Regional Autonomous Corporation) was performed in order to: a) validate the area of dry forest identified during the PIF stage; b) assess the importance of the sites for the conservation of dry forests; c) determine the potential to enhance connectivity between forest patches; d) identify opportunities for reduction of land degradation processes; and e) assess the potential for the implementation of REDD+ and improved hydrology (ecosystem services) and socioeconomic conditions of the local population. The application of these criteria combined led to the elimination of about 80% of the dry forest area initially identified at the PIF stage and the selection of 27,936 hectares of remaining tropical dry forest. The selection criteria are detailed in Annex 8.6 of the Project Document.</p> <p>The reduction in forest area also led to the reduction in the number of land use zoning plans (POT, in Spanish) that will incorporate SFM and SLM considerations to effectively contribute to the reduction of dry forest deforestation and desertification. The reduction in forest area also means that GEF resources will concentrate only on six (6) municipalities that will develop the land use zoning plans rather than 17 as originally stated in the PIF.</p> <p>The development and implementation of at least six (6) Watershed Management Plans was removed from the project's final design due to the high cost. It must be noted that this cost was underestimated at the PIF stage and it would have been impossible to afford these plans even if the total co-financing initially identified at the time of the PIF was available.</p>	<p>CEO Endorsement Request: Part II: Project Justification; A.5. Incremental / Additional cost reasoning.</p>
--	--	---

	The concentration of the GEF investment in the revised proposed project sites is in line with the comment from the Swiss Government representative to the GEF Council, which recommended the use of other economic activities for securing long-term feasibility of the project. The GEF resources will be directed to pay for the incremental activities to generate additional economic incentives (i.e., agroforestry and silvopastoral systems) to promote the sustainable management of forest resources and limit deforestation in other forested areas.	
21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?  October 08, 2013 Project structures are generally close to the PIF however see Q15 regarding the down scaling of outputs for example the loss of 6 watershed management plans, please explain why this is not the loss of an integral project component; the reduction in REDD+ pilot projects by over 80% has not been explained.	Please see response to Question 15.	Please see response to Question 15.

### ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>6</sup>

#### A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

There were no significant findings that affected the project design. Other than the reduction in cofinancing already mentioned and the risks identified initially during the PIF and validated during the PPG phase, for which risk mitigation measures have been defined, there are no significant concerns that might affect project implementation.

#### B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$100,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
1. Evaluation of the institutional framework and the policy and territorial planning instruments relevant to the project.	20,000	14,786.06	5,213.94
2. Evaluation of the socioeconomic benefits and needs regarding capacity strengthening of the local and regional stakeholders for the	30,000	24,786.06	5,213.94

<sup>6</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

implementation of the project activities.			
3. Establishment of the baseline for SFM/REDD+, land degradation (SLM), and biodiversity conservation for specific actions in the project work areas.	35,000	29,786.06	5,213.94
4. Final preparation of the project proposal, including feasibility and budgetary analysis.	15,000	9,786.06	5,213.94
<b>Total</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>79,144.24</b>	<b>20,855.76</b>

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used) NA**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)