



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

GEF ID:	9663		
Country/Region:	Colombia		
Project Title:	Colombia: Connectivity and Biodiversity Conservation in the Colombian Amazon		
GEF Agency:	World Bank and UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5715 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; BD-1 Program 2; BD-4 Program 9; LD-1 Program 2; SFM-1; SFM-3; SFM-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$21,000,000
Co-financing:	\$107,209,924	Total Project Cost:	\$128,209,924
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Karin Shepardson

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		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,		

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)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	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?	July 19, 2017 No significant changes in the project design have been reported.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	July 19, 2017 Yes, the project design and the complementary nature of the WB and UNDP-lead components will contribute to the project objectives and outcomes in an effective manner.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	July 19, 2017 Yes, this project is adequately resourced to achieves its goal and the various project objectives as well.	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	July 19, 2017 Both the WB and UNDP managed components present realistic risk profiles and mitigation measures are feasible and adequate.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	July 19, 2017 Yes, all cofinancing letters included.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	July 19, 2017 Yes.	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	July 19, 2017 NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	July 19, 2017 Yes and adequate coordination plans included.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	July 19, 2017 Yes, M&E plans outlined clearly.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	July 19, 2017 Yes and the main vehicle for sharing knowledge among the child projects will be the Amazon Coordination grant.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	July 19, 2017 Yes.	
	• STAP	July 19, 2017 Yes.	
	• GEF Council	July 19, 2017 Yes.	
	• Convention Secretariat	July 19, 2017 Yes.	

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	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	June 26, 2017 Yes.	
Review Date	Review	July 19, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		