

<b>Part I: Project Information</b>		<b>Response</b>
<b>GEF ID</b>	<b>10361</b>	
<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Paramos for Life</b>	
<b>Date of Screening</b>	6-Dec-19	
<b>STAP member Screener</b>	Rosie Cooney	
<b>STAP secretariat screener</b>	Virginia Gorsevski	
<b>STAP Overall Assessment</b>		<b>Concur:</b> STAP welcomes the project entitled "Paramos for life" in Colombia submitted by UNDP. Overall STAP feels that the objective of this project is very clear and is strongly supported by each of the various components. Importantly, the project accurately and comprehensively delineates between trends, threats and underlying driver and while a formal theory of change is not presented, the project logically links the proposed interventions to underlying drivers and the barriers that currently stand in the way of implementing existing laws designed to conserve the parama ecosystem.
<b>Part I: Project Information</b>		
<b>B. Indicative Project Description Summary</b>		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes. The objective is very clear and comprehensive with the primary focus on conservation of paramo ecosystems.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes. The planned activities are logically presented and support the project objectives.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Outcomes related to capacity building, increased participation, land use planning, improved management, enhanced connectivity, species monitoring, improved production practices, knowledge sharing - all support the stated objective.
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes.
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Yes.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
<b>1. Project description. Briefly describe:</b>		
1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	This project does a good job accurately and comprehensively delineating between trends, threats and underlying drivers and includes sufficient documentation.
	For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?	N/A

2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Baseline information relates to total dollars invested in conservation and management of paramo ecosystems as well as some related projects.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	In terms of investment, yes.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Difficult to assess from a scientific point of view since the baseline information is focused on investment, in which case the additional cost seems reasonable given the breadth and depth of activities and the fact that they will complement previous and ongoing projects in the area.
	For multiple focal area projects:	
	are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	N/A
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	N/A
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	N/A
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	A theory of change is not presented but the project logically links the proposed interventions to underlying drivers and the barriers that currently stand in the way of implementing existing laws designed to conserve the paramo ecosystem.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	The project includes many activities - it is not clear what the specific sequence is - could be simultaneous, including those described above.
	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	As above
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	Yes.
	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	Yes - the project specifically mentions adaptive management in Component 4.
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Yes. The laws protecting the paramo are in place. GEF funding is needed to help strengthen governance, implement biodiversity friendly ag and mining practices, and build the capacity needed to implement necessary changes.
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	N/A
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	The benefits are global. They are measurable in terms of those areas that will be evaluated using the METT, which assumes that improved management results in increased biodiversity.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes. The project is based on several well thought out components, which combined should result in positive change for a reasonably sized investment of funds.
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	As per GEF indicators (i.e. total hectares under improved management, etc.)

	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Some indicators are provided for each of the various components which can be measured (i.e. 15% increase in management effectiveness, etc.)
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	Climate change is listed as a medium risk for the parama and this project. The project addresses this through the its focus on connectivity of ecosystems and support for biodiversity friendly production systems.
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	Not particularly.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	If successful, can be replicated in other areas where the parama ecosystem exists.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Both. Incremental adaptation will be required to build capacity and support increase participation by various stakeholders. Changing farming and mining practices will likely require more abrupt, transformational change.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Map and geocoding is not available in the PIF.
<b>2. Stakeholders.</b> Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?	Yes.
	What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?	Stakeholder roles are well defined.
<b>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</b> Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd	Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Yes.
	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?	Gender plan will be developed.

<b>5. Risks.</b> Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?	Yes. All of the risks will be incorporated into the project design.
	Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?	Climate change and conflict and unclear tenure are all risks which could affect the project.
	For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:	
	· How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?	Not described.
	· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?	No,
	· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?	See above re connectivity.
	· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?	The project will seek out lessons learned from SCCF project (ID 4610).
<b>6. Coordination.</b> Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives	Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?	Yes.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	See above re ID 4610.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	Not yet.

	Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?	A specific mechanism is not described in the coordination section.
<b>8. Knowledge management.</b> Outline the “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project, and how it will contribute to the project’s overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	Network of exchange information between the three parama landscapes. No metrics described.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	Community and gender and ethnic based communication best practice program to share knowledge locally.
<b>STAP advisory response</b>	<b>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</b>	
<b>1. Concur</b>	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. The proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.	
	<i>* In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that “STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design.”</i>	
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:	
	(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;	
	(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.	
	The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.	
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:	
	(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.	