



Páramos for Life

Basic Information

GEF ID

10361

Countries

Colombia

Project Title

Páramos for Life

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6296

GEF Focal Area(s)

Biodiversity

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, project is fully aligned with GEF-7 BD strategy, 1-1, and 2-7 combining elements of biodiversity mainstreaming and protected area management within a globally important ecosystem. Cleared.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, this project is a very well-tailored intervention building upon existing national policy on the management of the Paramo with specific and achievable outputs and outcomes and a series of components that make logical sense given the existing management and investment baseline in the project geographies. Cleared.

Agency Response

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, for the most part the presentation of cofinancing and the documentation of the cofinancing is clear.

Please clarify how and why the project is classifying \$4.5 million as investment mobilized when according to footnote (a) these resources are associated with USAID and EU project investments which are later identified as part of the baseline.

Please clarify how and why the project is classifying \$250,000 from HECO (see footnote b) as investment mobilized as to our understanding HECO is still in its embryonic stages of development.

Please clarify how and why the project is classifying \$1.2 million from IDEAM as investment mobilized (see footnote c) as these resources appear to also come from an existing project and thus might be part of the baseline.

11/1/2019

Adequate clarifications provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

The USAID and EU project investments (\$4.5 million) are indeed part of the baseline; accordingly, these investments were removed from the project co-financing. Nevertheless, we have identified additional cofinancing to make up for this shortfall:

First, \$2,930,000 USD through the project *Supporting the new integrated Colombian approach to territorial governance in sustainable, productive and resilient landscapes* has been included as investment mobilized. This project, recently funded (2019) by the EU, will contribute to the conservation of páramos and high mountain landscapes in the Central Cordillera, including the conversion and substitution of production activities within páramos and the conservation of biodiversity in high mountain ecosystems

Second, \$1,570,000 USD through the MADS/IDEAM/Boyacá Regional Autonomous Corporation (CORPOBOYACÁ) project *Integrated Water Resource Management of the Tota Lake Basin*, has been included as investment mobilized. This project, recently funded (2019) by the French Cooperation Agency, includes the Tota páramo that is adjacent to the Pisba Páramo Complex; this system of interconnected páramos is highly important in terms of biodiversity and water resources. Related activities that will be implemented include land use zoning and payment for ecosystem services, in addition to governance, conflict resolution, and local community participation.

Regarding the Colombia Heritage Program (HECO), the country is making quick progress in its implementation as mandated by the 2018-2022 National Development Plan (NDP). In this regard, the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS) and Natural National Parks (PNN) are implementing HECO in a coordinated manner, to ensure the financial capacity and sustainability of protected areas and other conservation strategies. Special attention has been given, to the páramo ecosystems, in order to increase conservation efforts on the ground by the private sector and local communities. As part of the national government's commitment, HECO is able to use public resources originating from the carbon tax^[1] towards conservation and integrated management goals. A portion of the financial resources from the carbon tax will be used as co-financing investment mobilized (\$250,000) and administered by the National Parks System.

The IDEAM investment of \$1.2 million USD corresponds to a recently approved (July 8, 2019) regional project, wherein the Colombian portion will be implemented in the Puracé Paramo Complex and includes actions to: 1) protect sensitive environments such as páramos that provide important water-storage services, particularly to the city of Popayan with a population of approximately 260,000 people; 2) zoning; and 3) conservation of high mountain ecosystems including páramos. This IDEAM project, with financial support provided by the Adaptation Fund, and the GEF Páramo project proposed herein are key elements of the strategy to protect critical páramo ecosystems by the Government of Colombia. Accordingly, the IDEAM investment is considered as co-financing/investment mobilized and is not part of the baseline.

^[1] Tax Reform, Article 223, Law 1819/2016.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response**Core indicators****6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

October 8, 2019

Please clarify why in Table B under Component 2, Outcome 1 the target of 379,254 hectares protected by conservation strategies is not reflected in the Core Indicators in Table F. While all 379,254 hectares may not be managed under formal protected areas (it appears that only 128,000 hectares in protected areas) Table F should track the remaining hectares under the appropriate Core Indicator, most likely indicator 4.

In the table that describes Global Environmental Benefits later in the PIF, the project identifies KBAs totaling 379,254 as being under conservation management strategies, while 128,000 hectares of PAs are under improved management. It is not clear if there is overlap between these figures or if the total area is 379,254 of which 128,000 is under PAs. Please revise accordingly in all tables in the PIF as well as in Table F given that the current presentation is confusing on these points.

11/1/2019

Adequate clarifications provided on the points raised. However, we note that in the Table B, 2,000 hectares are identified as the restoration area target. But in the section on core indicators only 1,000 hectares is entered. Please clarify.

11/1/2019

Hectares corrected. Cleared.

Agency Response

Please note that the three prioritized páramo complexes have a total area of 379,254 ha, 128,000 ha of which are under strict protected area management (i.e., Pisba National Park: 45,000 ha and Puracé National Park: 83,000 ha) and 251,254 ha of páramos that are not protected areas and will be subject to conservation strategies.

The 251,254 ha correspond to: Puracé/Key Biodiversity Area [KBA]: 54,760 ha; Pisba/KBA: 61,241 ha, and Santurbán: 135,253 ha). This number of hectares (251,254 ha) was included in relevant sections of the PIF (i.e., Table B of Component 2, Outcome 1; the Core Indicator 4 in Table F; the table that describes the Global Environmental Benefits; and the GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet).

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Please also tag Payment for Ecosystem Services in Table G.

11/1/2019

Adequate clarifications provided. Cleared.

Agency Response Payment for Ecosystem Services in Table G was tagged as suggested.

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, clearly articulated problem statement and related root causes and barriers. Cleared.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes for the most part, however, please see cofinancing section above for clarification on USAID and EU projects that are presented as baseline investments, but where, at the same time, some resources appear to be identified as investment mobilized.

11/1/2019

Adequate clarifications provided. Cleared.

Agency Response Please refer to the response to Question 3 Part II – Project Justification above for clarification regarding USAID and EU projects.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, clearly aligned with GEF-7 BD strategy focus on mainstreaming and protected areas. Cleared.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

October 8, 2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

October 8, 2019

As noted in other parts of the review sheet, please clarify the actual area under improved management for paramo conservation, both within and outside of formal protected areas and ensure that this is reflected in the core indicators.

11/1/2019

Adequate clarifications provided. Cleared.

Agency Response Please refer to the response to Question 6 Part II – Project Justification above for clarification of the actual area under improved management for páramo conservation, both within and outside of formal protected areas, and how this is reflected in the core indicators.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, the PIF documents the project's innovation and sustainability. Potential to expand the proposed approach to other paramos in Colombia is high given the policy framework that already exists that promotes sustainable paramo management. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, an exhaustive mapping of stakeholders is presented along with plans for engagement going forward. Cleared.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, gender context and plans for promoting empowerment of women is embedded in the project design as currently formulated in the PIF with plans for further engagement in the PPG and project implementation stage clearly articulated. Cleared.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, the importance of private sector engagement with key sectoral actors is made (mining and agriculture), including small-scale producers within each sector, and the engagement strategy for the PPG and implementation phase is based on previous experiences and good practices in conservation interventions; i.e., use of intersectoral platforms to broker consensus and foster collaborative decision making, etc. Cleared.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, a thorough risk analysis is presented with fair appraisals of said risks. Current thinking on mitigation strategies is acceptable at PIF stage, but please elaborate a more robust mitigation strategy during the PPG phase. Cleared.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Yes, project is uniquely positioned and designed to help implement country priorities for paramo management as well as the NBSAP and thus is in full alignment with country strategies. Cleared.

Agency Response**Knowledge Management**

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Please outline a more detailed KM plan that specifies how the project will share good practice and knowledge about paramo management based on the project's design approach and disseminate this to other opportunities for sustainable paramo management in Colombia, taking advantage of the expertise, position, and reach of IAVH, IDEAM, PNN, as well as other relevant stakeholders. The current KM section is entirely generic and could be applied to any project, anywhere, in any focal area.

11/1/2019

Adequate clarifications provided. Cleared.

Agency Response Solutions and best practices will be shared through different national and global platforms. At the country level the project will make use of information portals such as the Colombia Environmental Information System (SIAC) administered by MADS and IDEAM; the Forest and Carbon Monitoring System (SMBYC) administered by IDEAM; the Information System of the National Water Resource Monitoring Program administered by IDEAM; the Information System for the Monitoring of Natural National Parks of Colombia (SULA) administered by PNN; the National Single Registry of Protected Areas (RUNAP) with specific updates for the Pisba National Park and the Puracé National Park administered by PNN; the Biodiversity Information System (SIB) administered by IAVH; and the System of Environmental and Biodiversity Indicators at the National Level, which is a collaborative effort between IDEAM, IAVH, and the Agustín Codazzi Geographic Institute (IGAC). Global platforms include the Convention on Biological Diversity, IUCN, the Panorama – Solutions for a Healthy Planet, and the Regional Andean Forest Network (Colombia, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru).

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

November 1, 2019

Yes, the project has been endorsed by the OFP but there is a problem with the endorsement letter. The LoE only includes the Agency fee amount for the GEF Project Financing (\$332,782) – however, it does not include the PPG Agency fee amount. In the Portal, a request was for \$150,000 was made for the PPG and it also included an Agency fee of \$14,250 which is not included in the LoE.

Please amend the submission by either reducing the Agency Fee of the GEF Project Financing by \$14,250 or by providing a new LOE that addresses this discrepancy.



November 6, 2019

New endorsement letter provided that addresses previous oversight. Cleared.

Agency Response

6 Nov 2019:

Revised Letter of Endorsement has been uploaded

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 8, 2019

Please revise the PIF per comments above and resubmit.

11/1/2019

Please address the issue raised with regards to the restoration area target and resubmit.

11/1/2019

Please correct the issue related to the endorsement letter and resubmit.

11/6/2019

Yes. PIF is recommended for CEO clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

November 1, 2019

By the time of CEO Endorsement, UNDP needs to present: (i) a detailed explanation of the mechanism through which the Executing Entities will select the proposals and disburse the funds (if planned) in Component Two (70 conservation agreements); and (ii) how UNDP will ensure that the Minimum Fiduciary Standards Requirements are met by each one of the Executing Entities at all levels of the project implementation.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/8/2019	10/31/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/1/2019	11/6/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/1/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/6/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval