



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

GEF ID:	4772		
Country/Region:	Colombia		
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.		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4720 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$8,787,819
Co-financing:	\$39,460,200	Total Project Cost:	\$48,248,019
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	February 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ian Gray	Agency Contact Person:	Santiago Carizosa

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	December 13, 2011 Yes - CBD: 1994, CCD: 1999.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	December 13, 2011 Yes - letter from A Soto Carreno is available.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	December 13, 2011 Yes, UNDP has considerable experience in developing both BD and LD projects in the region and supporting SFM and REDD+ projects. UNDP is also participating in UNREDD-related discussions in Colombia.	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	December 13, 2011 There is no non-grant instrument.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	December 13, 2011 Yes links with the UNDAF objectives. UNDP has identified 2 country office staff and regional backstopping is in place.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	December 13, 2011 Yes the requested amounts are within the total STAR allocation.	
	• the focal area allocation?	December 13, 2011 Yes, the requested FA amounts are within the allocations yet to be programmed which at 12/12/11 stand at: BD \$37,490,000; CC \$11,230,000; LD \$2,440,000.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	December 13, 2011 Yes, the project is well aligned with the FA framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	December 13, 2011 Yes - BD-1 Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems LD-3 Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the wider landscape SFM/REDD-2 Strengthen the enabling environment to reduce GHG emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and enhance carbon sinks from LULUCF activities.</p>	
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>December 13, 2011 Yes. This project was identified within the NPFE in August 2011. The NCSA completed in 2010 includes efforts to foster synergies between agriculture and forest sectors for BD and sustainable landuse.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>December 13, 2011 Yes, the project components include CD at regional, municipal and community level planning processes and the use of tools for improved decision making. Component 2 includes explicit aims to develop a cadre of specialists within technical government teams and locally within community members. Benefit sharing mechanism will in particular contribute to implementation of project activities at local level.</p>	
	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>December 13, 2011 The problems of forest loss and degradation through unsustainable use are clearly made as is the perilous position of remnant dry forests and its under-representation within the PA system. The outline of baseline activities on Page 6 is welcome but please identify as far as possible projected budgets for the baseline project as much of the figures provided are historical.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>January 05, 2012            Additional information on on-going conservation activities in the dry forest, the RAC's conservation and restoration actions and the national R-PP is now included. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>December 13, 2011            The development of new and improved management of PAs is clear. Please provide some additional information on expected investments in terms of REDD structures such as development of reference levels and MRV systems that are identified within the Colombia R-PP.</p> <p>January 05, 2012            This is clearer given the additional information on the baseline project and explains that activities are complementary to R-PP activities on reference levels and MRV systems. It is understood that no GEF funds will be used to cover transaction costs related to REDD+ projects.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>December 13, 2011            Yes - but please clarify how the project is building on existing efforts to develop REDD infrastructure.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>January 05, 2012 Additional information included in text.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>December 13, 2011 Please explain the rationale for opting for artificial restocking rather than controlling grazing pressure and using natural regeneration within rehabilitation elements.</p> <p>January 05, 2012 Additional information provided. Given the high disturbance in the rehabilitation areas, BD benefits are questionable therefore this is only permissible as a LD-funded element.</p>	
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>December 13, 2011 Yes socio-economic benefits are identified with the communities involved with field activities. Clear description of the REDD benefit sharing mechanism will be expected at CEO Endorsement. The use of a gender specialist during PPG phases noted. 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>January 05, 2012 Additional details about the PAs which will be IUCN Type V and VI which support sustainable resource uses have been included as has detail of the generation of management co-agreements with local communities in addition to capacity building efforts.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>December 13, 2011 Local communities are included in both planning and implementation elements of the project. TNC and CI are identified as BINGOs involved in the project - what local CSOs are involved in the project?</p> <p>January 05, 2012 Additional detail included.</p>	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>December 13, 2011 Yes key risks are identified and addressed. The issue of land tenure and rights is noted and clear indication of how this is being addressed will be expected at CEO Endorsement. Also, 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.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>December 13, 2011 As raised in Q13 please provide some additional detail on coordination with REDD efforts through the R-PP process. Lessons from the Titi Project seem particularly pertinent on rehabilitation efforts.</p> <p>January 05, 2012 Additional information provided.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>December 13, 2011 Yes the roles of MADS, IDEAM, IA vH and the Regional Corporations are outlined.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>December 13, 2011 Management costs are slightly above the 5% threshold, please ensure PMC is below this level.</p> <p>January 05, 2012 PMC now below 5%.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>December 13, 2011 Yes - funding levels are generally in line with planned activities.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>December 13, 2011 Cofinance is at 1:2.97 which is relatively low, please identify additional co-finance sources.</p> <p>January 05, 2012 Additional cofinance of \$325,000 (in-kind) and \$37,000 (grant) has been received from IDEAM. This increases co-finance from 1:2.97 to 1:3.01. The co-finance ratio should be significantly higher. Please identify significant additional co-finance sources.</p> <p>January 09, 2012 Additional co-finance has been included from Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS)</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		which will now contribute \$13,750,000 grant and \$1,250,000 in-kind. Total co-finance now stands at \$39,460,200, a ratio of 1:4.5.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	December 13, 2011 UNDP will contribute \$1,015,000 in cash which is approximately 12% of GEF total project cost.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	December 13, 2011 Not at this stage, please address above points.  January 05, 2012 PIF is improved however please address Q25 relating to co-finance.  January 09, 2012. Issues addressed. PIF clearance recommended.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	1. Climate resilience of remnant dry forests and longer term viability.	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		2. REDD benefit sharing mechanism.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 13, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 05, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 09, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.