



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9441		
Country/Region:	Colombia		
Project Title:	Contributing to the Integrated Management of Biodiversity of the Pacific Region of Colombia to Build Peace		
GEF Agency:	FAO and UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9; BD-1 Program 1; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-1; SFM-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$7,562,558
Co-financing:	\$35,299,999	Total Project Cost:	\$42,862,557
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Frank Hartwich

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>In Part II, Project Justification, Section 3 of the PIF, the proponent is asked to demonstrate how the project is aligned with the GEF strategic objectives and programs. In the course of altering the PIF Format, this section was accidentally deleted. Please include in a revised version.</p>	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>The project component 3 on SFM does not seem well-integrated into the overall goal of the project. The key driver of biodiversity loss is identified as the fact that local people do not have any viable economic options which is addressed by component two of the project. Component three on SFM seems to be an add-on component. In the revised PIF, please address this point within the overall design and when discussing how the project is aligned with the SFM strategy.</p> <p>July 29, 2016</p> <p>Please note that under Component 2, outcome 2.2 that any new formal protected areas are to meet the KBA criteria per the GEF-6 strategy. Please clarify this in the PIF in the relevant sections of the PIF document throughout.</p> <p>September 12, 2016</p> <p>The issue of the application of the KBA Standard is not yet adequately addressed. These criteria, now formally adopted by IUCN as the Key Biodiversity Area Standard, are not clearly conveyed in the PIF. Please</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		note clearly in Table B and paragraph 63 that the KBA standard will be applied when identifying the new protected areas to be created under this project. Whenever referring to the KBA Standard use capitalization and also please reference the GEF-6 BD strategy and our use of the KBA Standard when identifying and creating new protected areas.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>Please describe how the project is consistent with the country's NBSAP.</p> <p>July 29, 2016</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>The PIF provides a thorough analysis of the drivers of degradation of ecosystems in the project target area.</p> <p>However, with regards to sustainability, the project is covering a very small area at a very high cost per hectare. For example, the cost for protected area management is \$35/hectare. In terms of production landscapes, the cost is \$80/hectare for BD friendly production and for SLM</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the cost is a more reasonable but still very expensive 21\$/hectare. Thus, this is not a sustainable investment as all these costs per hectare are financially unsustainable and exceed standard cost norms. Is there a mistake in the estimation of the area coverage of the project which might be the reason that the cost per hectare is so high? Please either increase the area that the project investment will cover or clarify why the cost per hectare is so very high.</p> <p>The conservation approach is not innovative, and in fact, the GEF has supported similarly designed projects in the past in Colombia. However, the contribution the project may make to the peace process is quite innovative. Please clarify how the design of the conservation mosaic approach has been altered to address this challenge. The current project is not clear in how the element of implementing the mosaic approach within this particular social context is being addressed and considered in project implementation. Please clarify.</p> <p>The PIF aspires to implement a strategy of "sustainable use" of biodiversity as an economic</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>development engine and guarantor of "long-term sustainability of the intervention"; while the literature shows this has been extremely difficult in practice. Please clarify on what basis (market analysis of product potential, productive capacity of land, etc.) has the project based this aspect of the project upon. Please reference market studies or surveys that have been conducted that provides sufficient confidence in pursuing the strategy presented to address the main causes of deforestation ("linked to lack of livelihoods".) For example, the PIF notes on page 10 that there is a "large market" for food products derived native fruits of the region, but the PIF does not provide a citation for this claim. Please clarify.</p> <p>July 29, 2016</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>The baseline section is very lengthy and includes interesting information but unfortunately it does not provide a very good analysis of the baseline projects and activities relevant to the components of the project. Please revise this section and discuss what</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>would happen in the absence of a GEF investment, what is the current state of funding in the project area in the thematic areas of the project, and the baseline scenario seen through the lens of the project components and the ongoing action to address the drivers of biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation.</p> <p>The baseline discussion in relation to component two should describe the status of implementation of the Nagoya Protocol (NP) and if the project plans to assist with implementation of the NP given the relationship of component two with the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol.</p> <p>July 29, 2016</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>Within Table B, please be sure to identify the type of financing (TA or INV) for each component. Current draft is missing this in Components 3 and 4. Please provide.</p> <p>Only project component two is designed to reverse some of the extractive practices that are</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>undertaken such as illegal logging, expansion of the agricultural frontier, illicit crops, infrastructure development, increased migration, mining etc. However, this component alone does not seem very sufficient to address these drivers of biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation. In particular, it is not particularly clear how component three and to a certain degree component one will address these drivers of environmental degradation. Please clarify.</p> <p>Based on the problem description and the aim to achieve global environmental benefits, the project design seems to call for large investments in components one and two with very little justification for the investment in Component Three. Please clarify.</p> <p>For component one, what will the project measure to assess biodiversity condition? Please provide to complement existing outcome measures.</p> <p>Component two refers to a "BD-friendly" label. Please clarify what this is and how biodiversity criteria are addressed when this label is provided to a product. Is this the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>same as the "Ecologic Food Label" referenced elsewhere in the report? Please clarify if the market share for this label in Colombia large enough to be a reliable strategy to address the livelihood objectives identified in the project design as a means to reduce threats to forest and biodiversity.</p> <p>July 29, 2016</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>As regards consideration of gender elements and indigenous people the PIF is adequate.</p> <p>There appears to be little to no participation of CSOs. Please clarify.</p> <p>For socio-economic aspects, please refer to comments above under question 3 and sustainability.</p> <p>July 29, 2016</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
<p>Availability of Resources</p>	<p>7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>July 29, 2016</p> <p>Please note that resources from SFM are extremely limited at this time and access cannot be guaranteed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>NA.</p>	
<p>Recommendations</p>	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>No.</p> <p>First, please correct all basic formatting issues listed below:</p> <p>For Table A, please indicate GEFTF for SFM objectives.</p> <p>For Table B, components three and four please identify financing type.</p> <p>For Table D, please complete correctly (programming of funds).</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>The PIF is 27 pages long without Annexes. Please be more concise.</p> <p>For Part III, section A is entirely blank. Please complete.</p> <p>For Part III, section B there is no date for Gustavo Merino's signature.</p> <p>FAO and UNIDO may wish to institute a system to check all submissions before presenting them to ensure that clerical errors are all addressed before a formal submission is made.</p> <p>Please address all issues above and resubmit. Please also consider the time frame for the project as a project of this complexity and scope may require more than 4 years to effectively implement.</p> <p>Please number all paragraphs in the PIF.</p> <p>July 29, 2016</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Please address and clarify the issue in question one and resubmit.</p> <p>September 12, 2016</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review	March 21, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 29, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation			
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		