



REQUEST FOR: CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Conservation of biodiversity in landscapes impacted by mining in the Chocó Biogeographic Region			
Country(ies):	Colombia	GEF Project ID: ¹	4916
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5035
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development (MADS), Ministry of Mines and Energy (MME); National Parks System of Colombia (UASPNN); Regional Autonomous Corporations (CARs) and local governments; Environmental Research Institute of the Pacific (IIAP); and World Wildlife Fund – Colombia (WWF).	Submission Date:	December 18, 2013
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	585,000
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 		

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-1. Improve sustainability of protected area systems	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas	Output 1: New protected areas (2) and coverage (404,671 ha) of unprotected ecosystems	GEFTF	1,055,715	19,556,776
BD-2. Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks	Output 1: Policies and regulatory frameworks (3) for production sectors Output 2: National and sub-national land-use plans (5) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation	GEFTF	4,794,285	11,085,976
Total project costs				5,850,000	30,642,752

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

Project Objective: To safeguard biodiversity in the Chocó biogeographic region from the direct impacts of gold, silver and platinum mining and indirect impacts of mining [population growth and development of agriculture, forestry, fisheries and other sectors]

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. The Policy, legal and planning framework in the mining sector addresses the direct threats to biodiversity from mining operations	TA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Three (3) national-level legal, policy, and planning instruments (Mining Code, Environmental License; and Guidelines for the designation of mining reserve areas) with recommendations and guidelines to incorporate environmental and social criteria to prevent, mitigate, and offset the direct impact of mining activity on biodiversity (BD) and ecosystem services. - Agencies from the mining (National Mining Agency [ANM]) and environmental (UASPNN, IIAP, National Environmental Licensing Agency [ANLA], CODECHOCO, CORPOURABA) sectors articulated in the unifying platform for information systems (UPIS). - Increase by 20% in the capacity of selected national (ANLA, ANM, MME, and MADS) and regional organizations (IIAP and CODECHOCO), to apply the revised policy and regulatory mining framework according to the UNDP's Capacity Development Scorecard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recommendations and guidelines for environmental and mining regulations (Mining Code, Environmental License, Guidelines for defining mining reserves) include requirements to prevent, mitigate, and offset the impact of mining activities on biodiversity. - Policy and regulation recommendations to incorporate the results of the Strategic Environmental Analysis (EAE) and considerations for the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services in the mining/environmental planning process (e.g., PDM, or regional land use/environmental plans [PGAR, POT, or POMCA]). - Existing information systems on environmental management conditions, licensing, and mining titles strengthen decision-making processes and facilitate compliance and monitoring of impacts on biodiversity. - Training program institutionalized and at least 300 people trained by end of the project, targeting the ANLA, the ANM, the Mining and Energy Planning Unit (UPME), the Colombian Geological Service (SGC), Regional Autonomous Corporations, the UASPNN (Western Andes and Pacific Units), departmental governments, municipal councils, community councils, and indigenous 	GEF TF	1,000,000	10,702,942

			councils and peasants working in the Chocó biogeographic region.			
2. Protection of biodiversity in areas highly vulnerable to the indirect effects of mining	TA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improvement by 20% in capacity of CARs (CODECHOCO), national-level PA managers (Las Orquídeas NP, Tatamá NP, Farallones de Cali NP, and Munchique NP) and community level organizations (ESPAVÉ, ASOCASAN, and COCOMACIA) to generate, use and share geographic, socioeconomic, and biophysical information needed for spatial planning and management purposes that take into consideration the indirect impacts of mining. Capacity is measured by the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard (200 people trained). - Four (4) existing protected areas (PAs) under sustainable management protect 334,671 hectares (ha) of local ecosystems. - Increase between 10% and 20% in the management effectiveness of four (4) PAs according to the management effectiveness scorecard (METT): a) Las Orquídeas NP: from 67% to 87%; b) Tatamá NP: from 43% to 63%; c) Farallones de Cali NP: from 53% to 73%; and d) Munchique NP: from 70% to 80%. - Avoided emissions due to tropical rain forest deforestation during a 5-year period: 1,342,971 tCO₂-e. - Avoided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Five Territorial Land Use Plans (POT) covering an area of 2 million ha delimit areas for development, including infrastructure placement, placement of settlements, farming, and forestry, taking into account BD importance. - Enforcement capabilities of regulatory bodies emplaced: compliance monitoring with planning structures set out in the POT/EOT, PM, POMCA; protocols to strengthen coordination and the implementation capacity of regulatory and control agencies; aerial surveys and other surveillance measures to assess compliance; improved policing and prosecution of malfeasance. - Management and control strategies for four national-level PAs (Tatamá NP, Las Orquídeas NP, Farallones de Cali NP, and Munchique NP) contribute to the reduction of indirect threats to BD associated with mining activities. - Two sustainable use plans for Indigenous Reserves/Afro-Colombian territories that are affected by mining activities are incorporated into the management tools of the CARs to facilitate their enforcement by ethnic authorities. - Gazettal of two (2) new multiple-use PAs (MUPAS) covering 70,000 ha (legal gazettal and boundary demarcation). - Strengthened institutional and 	GEF TF	4,571,429	18,407,673

		deforestation (ha) at the end of the project: 2,034.80 ha. – Increase by X% (target will be defined during the first six months of project implementation) in the annual average income of the local community members (including men and women) derived from the sale of two non-timber forest products (NTFP): assai palm (<i>Euterpe oleracea</i>) and jagua (<i>Genipa americana</i>).	community capacity for 200 people (know-how and equipment and other needs) for planning, administration, surveillance and control of protected areas. – Two feasibility analysis for the development of REDD+ projects undertaken with at least two communities of collective territories. – Sustainable use management system of NTFP to address impacts derived from commoditization of the resources as a strategy for conservation and use of biodiversity products and reduced dependence on mining activities. – One restoration pilot project (100 ha) to test the National Restoration Protocol (with co-financing from the IIAP).			
			Subtotal		5,571,429	29,110,615
			Project management Cost (PMC) ³	GEFTF	278,571	1,532,137
			Total project costs		5,850,000	30,642,752

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
Local Government	CODECHOCÓ	In-kind	82,353
Local Government	CODECHOCÓ	Cash	1,372,353
Local Government	CORPOURABÁ	In-kind	25,000
Local Government	CRC	Cash	720,588
Local Government	CVC	Cash	995,294
Local Government	Departmental Government of Antioquia	In-kind	185,999
Local Government	Departmental Government of Antioquia	Cash	478,066
Local Government	IIAP	In-kind	1,500,000
National Government	UASPNN	Cash	1,441,334
National Government	MME	Cash	1,041,765
Foundation	WWF	In-kind	500,000
Foundation	WWF	Cash	500,000
Bilateral Aid Agency (ies)	USAID	Cash	19,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	2,800,000
Total Co-financing			30,642,752

³ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹: NA

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	42,000	0	42,000
National/Local Consultants	170,700	0	170,700

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF⁴

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc. NA

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. NA

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage: NA

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

1. Under the baseline scenario, BD conservation in the mining environment of the Chocó biogeographic region will have limited chances for success. The baseline analysis is divided into three areas of investment: environment, legal-institutional, and socioeconomic aspects.

2. ***Environment:*** The analyses performed during the design phase established that the project’s prioritized area (the municipalities in the north and northwest portions of the departments of Chocó and Antioquia, respectively, and the Las Orquídeas, Tatamá, Farallones de Cali, and Munchique National Parks [NP]) will be targeted for investment in conservation of PAs, tropical forest restoration, and REDD+ projects and related activities.

3. The management effectiveness of each of the four National Parks prioritized by the project was assessed using Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) (Tracking Tool for Biodiversity Projects in GEF-3, GEF-4, and GEF-5). The assessment covered questions and scores stipulated in Objective 1, sections I, II, and III. In order to complete the management status assessment, all scores were entered with the feedback of PA staff in each area and with support from two officials of the northwestern and Pacific territorial divisions of the UASPNN. Financial information was provided by each of the PA directors and the officials in charge of estimating the financial gap at the UASPNN headquarters in Bogotá. The results showed that most national PAs assessed are operating below basic management standards and that they lack the required budget for basic management activities. This is evident in the low scores in all areas regarding institutional capacity, investment in research, and BD management. Out of 99 possible points (total METT score); the management effectiveness assessments yielded the following scores: Las Orquídeas NP – 67, Tatamá NP – 43, Farallones de Cali NP – 53, and Munchique NP – 70. Currently, the management plans for the four PAs are being updated and are projected to be completed by the end of 2013. The Financial Sustainability Scorecard (FSS - Tracking Tool) for these PAs indicated a total score of 31%, suggesting deficiencies in all components assessed: a) legal, regulatory, and institutional frameworks (41%); b) business planning and tools for cost-effective management (22%); and c) tools for revenue generation (27%).

⁴ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question

4. The national government will continue to provide an average of USD \$233,695 budget for the management and administration each of these areas, or a total budget for these four areas of USD \$1,039,780 in 2013. It is expected that this investment will increase yearly by no more than the inflation factor. It is not clear whether the Conservation Mosaics project, which is operated by the Natural Heritage Fund and financed by the GEF, will continue contributing to the management of Las Orquídeas NP and Farallones de Cali NP. The UASPNN has no plans to establish new PAs in the area of interest of the project.

5. The IIAP and the UASPNN are implementing activities for the restoration and tropical rain forests in the departments of Antioquia and Chocó. The IIAP is currently trying to establish three pilot restoration plots; despite technical progress of the project, severe budget limitations they face in 2013 may impede the fulfillment of activities planned for these pilot projects. There is a similar situation with regard to participatory restoration strategies in Las Orquídeas NP and Farallones de Cali NP; budget limitations in these areas severely affect the continuity of these initiatives. CODECHOCÓ and CORPOURABÁ have included restoration projects for degraded areas (1,800 ha and 600 ha, respectively) in their 2013-2015 action plans. Nonetheless, specific investment amounts or locations for these initiatives have not been specified.

6. Funding from the U.S. government through USAID has made it possible to plan and design 14 REDD+ projects for the Chocó biogeographic region. Out of these, five are located in northern Chocó and Antioquia, where they are being designed and had two possible investors during 2013.

7. **Legal/Institutional**: There is a clear institutional weakness among agencies present in the Chocó biogeographic region due to lack of financial resources for effective monitoring, surveillance, and control of renewable and non-renewable natural resources, which has sped up degradation processes affecting associated BD and ecosystem services. This lack of clear public policies that guide decisions in strategic areas and the absence of environmental considerations in planning instruments have made this a vulnerable area.

8. At the regional scale, CODECHOCÓ and CORPOURABA will invest USD \$1,000,000 in institutional development, which will benefit the Chocó region. The IIAP plans to invest USD \$200,000 in the development of a methodological tool to prioritize strategic ecosystems based on biological, social, economic, and vulnerability criteria. This activity will be performed in the wetland complex located in the middle Atrato River basin of the department of Chocó. Likewise, an ongoing investment of USD \$200,000 is directed toward improving the National Registry of information for development activities contemplated for the project.

9. The MADS will invest USD \$221,000 to update the legal framework for National Forest Reserves with the component focused on facilitating the development of the regulatory process. In addition, it plans to invest USD \$81,000 for the provision of technical support for the CARs, giving priority to those regions with high deforestation rates. It also intends to invest USD \$81,603 to provide additional enforcement to the laws that regulate zone division and use of forest ecosystems across the country, including the Chocó region, at the same time updating the forest cover map at the national scale to provide sufficient information on the multiple threats ecosystems face today.

A. 5. **Incremental /Additional cost reasoning**: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated **global environmental benefits** (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

10. The project's design complies with the original PIF. The structure of the project's components is similar to the PIF approved by GEF in April 2012. Nonetheless, during the PPG phase the project's outputs were reviewed and adjusted in some cases as shown below. Additionally, there was a reduction in co-financing from \$40,237,393 USD to \$30,642,752 USD, which resulted from a site prioritization analysis conducted during the PPG phase. Since the project area considered in the PIF was too broad (it included most of the Colombian Chocó biogeographic region), it was determined that the project's global environmental benefits would be maximized if the investment was more localized. Accordingly, the project will focus its efforts in municipalities and indigenous reserves/afro-Colombian territories in the middle and upper Atrato River basin and the upper San Juan River basin (northern Chocó biogeographic region), covering up to 2 million hectares. The project sites in the southern Chocó biogeographic region identified in the PIF that were not included means that co-financers initially identified in the PIF, such as the Regional Autonomous Corporation of Nariño (Corponariño), will not participate in the project. Additionally, the project will contribute to the strengthening of the management effectiveness of four national PAs covering 334,671 ha. Because it was determined that addressing the threat of mining activities from within the Los Farallones de Cali NP and Munchique NP was a priority, rather than the

corridor between the two, these two PAs were incorporated into the project, thereby increasing the total area of protected ecosystems that will benefit from the project. The selection criteria are detailed in Annex 8.7 of the Project Document and were determined with the participation of the MADS, CARs, UASPNN, and IIAP.

11. While a reduction in the amount of co-financing resources is reflected in the prioritization of areas, a commensurate reduction of GEF funds is not recommended because they will be used to pay for the incremental activities to improve the management effectiveness and reduce threats from mining to these PAs through the development of management and control strategies in line with their management plans, training of PA staff, and improved coordination mechanisms between PA staff and regional and municipal authorities to enhance monitoring, control, and surveillance.

PIF Outputs	Project Document Outputs
Component 1: The policy, legal, and planning framework in mining operations.	the mining sector addresses the direct threats to biodiversity from
The Mining Code, Environmental License and Environmental Impact Assessment Framework include requirements to prevent/mitigate and offset the impact of mining activities on biodiversity (including clearance of sensitive areas, mine tailings disposal and pollution to aquatic ecosystems).	The Mining Code, Environmental License, and Guidelines for defining mining reserves include recommendations and guidelines to prevent, mitigate, and offset the impact of mining activities on biodiversity. During the PPG phase, the regulatory and policy instruments that will be directly influenced by the project were assessed. Instead of the Environmental Impact Assessment Framework, the project will allow mainstreaming BD considerations into the Guidelines for defining mining reserves.
The National Mining Land Use Plan includes a Strategic Environmental Analysis (EAE) of the territory with emphasis on biodiversity considerations and the EAE recommendations become requirements for applicants seeking an Environmental License for mining.	The Mining Development Plan (PDM) or regional land use/environmental plans (Regional Environmental Management Plan [PGAR], POT, or Watershed Management Plan [POMCA]) includes the results of the Strategic Environmental Analysis (EAE) and considerations for the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services. During the PPG, national and regional environmental and mining authorities established that the project will allow incorporating EAE results, with an emphasis on BD and ecosystem services considerations, into national (PDM) or regional (e.g., PGAR, POT, or POMCA) mining/environmental planning instruments rather than into the National Mining Land Use Plan.
Rural development law or related decrees, resolutions and planning instruments include environmental/biodiversity criteria and are linked to the mining Environmental Licensing process.	This project output was removed due to the fact that the Rural Development Law is under discussion as part of the Colombian “peace talks” currently underway and there is no guarantee that a draft to include environmental/BD criteria in the Rural Development Law (or other related policy instruments) will be approved by the Congress.
Information system on environmental management conditions, licensing and mining titles strengthens decision-making processes and facilitates compliance and monitoring of impacts on biodiversity.	Existing information systems on environmental management conditions, licensing, and mining titles strengthens decision-making processes and facilitates compliance and monitoring of impacts on biodiversity. Rather than establishing an information system on environmental management conditions, licensing, and mining titles, the project will strengthen existing information systems within the MADS, the CARs, and the MME and will link them to facilitate the exchange of information.
Protocol with technical and economic guidelines to move forward recovery and restoration processes in areas degraded by mining activity, focused on biodiversity and ecosystem processes.	This output was removed since restoration protocols for degraded areas already exist as part of the Ecological Restoration National Plan (2013) approved by the MADS. These protocols will be used in the project’s Component 2, during the development of a pilot project for the restoration of 100 ha degraded by mining activities (with co-financing from the IIAP).
Training program institutionalized and 300 people trained by	Training program institutionalized and at least 300 people trained

<p>end of the project, targeting the National Environmental Licensing Agency and Regional Autonomous Corporations, municipalities, community councils, and indigenous reserves working in the Chocó.</p>	<p>by end of the project, targeting the National Environmental Licensing Agency, the National Mining Agency (ANM), the Mining and Energy Planning Unit (UPME), the Colombian Geological Service (SGC), Regional Autonomous Corporations, the UASPNN (Western Andes and Pacific Units), departmental governments, municipal councils, community councils, and indigenous councils and peasants working in the Chocó biogeographic region.</p> <p>The number of the beneficiary agencies was increased in order to ensure that the proposed project outputs in Component 2 are achieved as well as for the sustainability of the project.</p>
<p>Component 2: Protection of biodiversity in areas highly vulnerable to the indirect effects of mining.</p>	
<p>Enforcement capabilities of regulatory bodies emplaced: compliance monitoring with planning structures set out in the POT; aerial surveys and other surveillance measures to assess compliance; improved policing and prosecution of malfeasance</p>	<p>Enforcement capabilities of regulatory bodies emplaced: compliance monitoring with planning structures set out in the POT/EOT, PM, POMCA; protocols to strengthen coordination and the implementation capacity of regulatory and control agencies' aerial surveys and other surveillance measures to assess compliance; improved policing and prosecution of malfeasance.</p> <p>The scope of this project output was expanded to include other planning instruments in addition to the POT and the development of protocols and standards to be used by the mining authorities to ensure compliance with environmental requirements during mining operations.</p>
<p>Five participatory management plans for protected areas and two land management/ sustainable use plans for Indigenous Reserves/Afro-Colombian territories that are likely to be affected by indirect development activities stimulated by the mining economy. Plans specify management measures to address threats from encroachment, fire and hunting for the bush meat markets.</p>	<p>This project output was divided into two separate outputs as follows:</p> <p>a) Management and control strategies for four national-level PAs (Tatamá NP, Las Orquídeas NP, Farallones de Cali NP, and Munchique NP) contribute to the reduction of indirect threats to BD associated with mining activities.</p> <p>The project will not develop management plans for PAs as these will be developed by the government through the UASPNN as part of the baseline. Instead, the project will develop management and control strategies specifically for each of the four national-level PAs prioritized by the project (i.e., Tatamá NP, Las Orquídeas NP, Farallones de Cali NP, and Munchique NP), and which will be fully articulated with the PAs' management plans.</p> <p>b) Two sustainable use plans for Indigenous Reserves/Afro-Colombian territories that are affected by mining activities are incorporated into the management tools of the CARs to facilitate their enforcement by ethnic authorities.</p>
<p>Two voluntary market financed pilot projects for the generation of income in multiple-use protected areas by means of REDD+ provide a utilitarian incentive for the conservation of forest blocks covering 70,000 ha in the new PAs.</p>	<p>Two feasibility analysis for the development of REDD+ projects undertaken with at least two communities of collective territories.</p> <p>During the PPG, local communities expressed their interest in learning more about REDD+ and their associated benefits. Thus, it is still necessary to assess the environmental, social, and financial feasibility of a REDD+ project.</p>
<p>Sustainable use management system for wild resources harvested by communities including bush meat and non-timber forest products to address impacts from commoditization of the resources; establishment of sustainable off take levels, permissible harvest measures; conservation safeguards (including no take areas), monitoring and enforcement system by indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities.</p>	<p>Sustainable use management system for non-timber forest products to address impacts derived from commoditization of the resources as a strategy for conservation and use of biodiversity products and reduced dependence on mining activities.</p> <p>The PPG phase included an economic feasibility analysis of sustainable use management system for wild resources harvested by communities that led to selecting two non-timber forest products (assai palm [<i>Euterpe oleracea</i>] and jagua [<i>Genipa americana</i>]) to</p>

	be included as part of the project.
Fifteen hundred hectares of restoration pilot projects for degraded areas established on the basis of protocols developed in Component 1 (with co-financing).	One restoration pilot project (100 ha) to test the National Restoration Protocol (with co-financing from the IIAP). Restoration activities will be limited to the implementation of a 100-ha pilot restoration project using the existing MADS' restoration protocol that will be financed through co-financing provided by the IIAP.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

Risk	Rate*	Mitigation actions
The proposed legal and policy reforms are not achieved in a timely manner	M/H	The proposed legal and policy reforms will happen within a political environment that includes the Colombian “peace talks,” which are currently underway, and presidential and congressional elections in 2014. These events may include structural policy and legal reforms that slow down the delivery of the related legal and policy outputs despite the current support from environmental and mining authorities. The project will maintain all interested existing and future authorities informed about the project’s objectives and progress, and will incorporate the necessary follow-up activities in the annual plans to ensure that the results of the “peace talks” and the presidential/congressional elections are incorporated into project planning and management.
Government policies and programs will support unrestrained mining development in the biogeographic region of the Chocó as global prices for gold, silver, and platinum rise	M/H	Government support for amending the national mining policy and associated policy instruments is essential for the project’s success. The government has expressed its commitment to addressing the impacts of mining on BD, leading to the development of this initiative. To garner the legislative support necessary to review and approve new laws and incorporate environmental considerations into the policy and legislative agenda, should this commitment waver, the project will also draw upon the advocacy skills of the project’s partners, NGOs, and public research organizations.
Non-compliance of companies with new policy prescriptions, aimed at safeguarding BD	M	The project will support monitoring compliance of the commitments and conditions of the environmental licenses, and will support the environmental authorities in their monitoring and enforcement processes. The project will promote coordination between environmental and mining authorities in such a way that the approval of mining titles for companies that do not comply with the environmental safeguards is avoided. The project will develop monitoring and control protocols, which will be adopted by both environmental and mining authorities with the purpose of articulating information for decision-making.
Insecurity and violence in the Chocó impede project operation and execution	M	For the selection of areas where the project will be implemented (Vigia del Fuerte, Murindó, Frontino, Bojayá, Carmen del Darien, Rio Sucio, Tadó, San Jose del Palmar, and Buenaventura), safety conditions were considered as a criterion and the UNDP security group was consulted. If the selected areas demonstrate unsafe conditions, the project will re-focus their efforts to other areas of Chocó biogeographic region.
Resistance in local communities to the project due to distrust of government and high gold, silver, and platinum prices	L	Communities and other stakeholders will be participating in project design, planning, implementation, and evaluation processes starting with the PPG phase. Communities and other key stakeholders participated in the project design process, and all local stakeholder groups related to the project were properly identified and engaged in the project. Local communities will actively participate in the implementation of the project, both in the capacity-building, as well as in the implementation of a sustainable use management system for NTFP and in the development of land management/ sustainable use plans for Indigenous Reserves/Afro-Colombian territories.
The necessary permits for using NTFP are		The project will promote capacity-building of local stakeholders for the

Risk	Rate*	Mitigation actions
not granted by the environmental agency in a timely manner.	L	design and implementation of sustainable productive initiatives, as well as capacity-building of environmental authorities for enforcement and monitoring of said initiatives. The capacity of local communities to comply with standards will also be strengthened.
There is uncertainty due to constant changes in the national, regional, and local governments to adopt the tools designed within the project framework.	M	The project will promote inter-institutional mechanisms for cooperation and information sharing, thus guaranteeing that government agencies are informed about the project (progress and achievements, and maintaining their commitment with the project during its implementation. Officials will be invited to participate in the implementation and the monitoring and evaluation processes of the project.
The frequent rotation of officials and contractors of the participating entities in the project makes timely implementation of planning and training activities difficult.	M	The participation of the personnel who previously participated in the related formulation and processes will be encouraged. Events designed to familiarize personnel with the project processes will be encouraged for new officials in order for them to appropriate the tools created by the project.
Climate change negatively impacts BD in the Chocó biogeographic region.	M	The project will implement BD conservation actions in important areas of tropical rainforest that remain through traditional in situ conservation schemes in public PAs and non-traditional actions through schemes such as REDD+, as well as sustainable management of the collective territories. The establishment of new PAs will take into account climate change projections so that landscape and boundary designs contribute to mitigating potential impacts on BD, including corridors to facilitate species movement and provide refugia in a changing climate.
Dependency on the training to be delivered by the project for the achievement of the expected outcomes	M	Training will begin early in the implementation phase of the project to ensure that the required skills and knowledge are in place in a timely manner. The project will monitor the use and incorporation of knowledge gained by the different stakeholders using development capacity indicators (UNDP Development Capacity Scorecard). The UNDP's in-country and regional technical staff will provide support to project implementation. Finally, the project will be executed by the WWF, which has extensive experience in project implementation and will make use of its wide network of national and international BD and social experts for additional project support.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

GEF_ID	Project Name	Agency	Project Type	Coordination actions	Status
2551	Colombian National Protected Areas Conservation Trust Fund	IBRD	FSP	Strengthening PA management effectiveness in the Chocó biogeographic region	Under Implementation
3590	Mainstreaming Biodiversity in the Coffee Sector in Colombia	UNDP	FSP	Exchange of experiences and lessons learned about the development of sustainable production systems	Under Implementation
4111	Institutional and Policy Strengthening to Increase Biodiversity Conservation on Production Lands (PL)	UNDP	MSP	Exchange of experiences and lessons about the implementation of BD conservation activities and increase in income of local stakeholders	Under Implementation
3826	Designing and Implementing a National Sub-System of Marine Protected Areas (SMPA)	UNDP	FSP	Exchange of experiences and lessons about the strengthening of legal and institutional frameworks	Under Implementation
5160	Development and production of natural dyes in the Chocó Region of Colombia for the food, cosmetics, and personal care industries under the provisions of the Nagoya	UNDP	MSP	Exchange of experiences and lessons learned about marketing and value chains of NTFP and equitable distribution of benefits	CEO Endorsed

Protocol				
----------	--	--	--	--

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

12. Stakeholder engagement in the project was initiated during the PPG and a stakeholder participation plan for the project implementation phase was defined. These are described in the following paragraphs.

Stakeholder Participation during Project Preparation

13. During the PPG stage of the project, the main stakeholders participated in project planning and design workshops as well as multiple sessions and work meetings, including workshops in the project's prioritized areas. These participatory events included: a) PPG phase inception workshop; and b) a project results framework workshop. Additionally, multiple individual meetings and consultations with key national, regional, and local stakeholders were held during the PPG phase by the project team, UNDP CO, and staff from the MADS and WWF. Descriptions of the PPG phase workshops are presented below.

14. PPG phase inception workshop: The PPG phase inception workshop took was held November 12-13, 2012, in Bogotá, Colombia. The main objective of the workshop was to ensure the PIF and PPG forms approved by GEF for the project were made familiar to the different stakeholders involved in the process, and to define a work plan for the final formulation of the project. The workshop's specific objectives were: a) to inform about the institutional context and operational base for the project's development; b) to inform about the specific mechanisms and requirements of the PPG stage; c) to present the objectives of the project, including expected outcomes and outputs; d) to coordinate the actions and commitments from all partners involved; and e) to inform about the responsibilities of the consulting team.

15. Participants in the PPG inception workshop included officials from the MADS, MME, ANLA, ANM, UASPNN, IDEAM, CARs representatives (CODECHOCÓ, CORPONARIÑO), representatives from Antioquia's departmental administration, IAP, WWF, representative of the regional UNDP/GEF office, officers from the UNDP Colombia program, and the team of consultants for the PPG phase.

16. Project results framework workshop: The workshop was held June 4-5, 2013, in Bogotá, Colombia. The objectives of this workshop were: a) to define the results framework for the project, including outputs, indicators, baseline information, goals, verification mechanisms, and assumptions; b) to define the preliminary project activities per output; c) to define the budgetary basis of the project, including co-financing; and d) to update the PPG work plan. Participants in this workshop included officials from the MADS, MME, ANLA, ANM, UASPNN, IDEAM, CODECHOCÓ representatives, representatives from Antioquia's departmental administration, IAP, WWF, representatives of the regional UNDP/GEF office, UNDP Colombia program officials, and consultants for the PPG stage.

Stakeholder Participation Plan for the Project Implementation Phase

17. The objectives of the stakeholder participation plan are: a) to clearly identify the basic roles and responsibilities of the main stakeholders of the project; b) to ensure the full awareness of the stakeholders with regard to the progress of the project's development and any obstacles that may arise, and to utilize the experience and skills of these stakeholders to improve the projected actions; and c) to identify key moments within the project's lifecycle during which participation will be most effective. The final objective of the stakeholder's participation plan will be to ensure the long-term sustainability of the project's achievements, based on transparency and effective participation.

Summary of Stakeholder Roles in Project Implementation:

Stakeholders	Description of Stakeholders' Roles in Project Implementation
MADS (Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development)	MADS is the GEF focal point and the public agency responsible for the formulation of national policy related to the environment and renewable natural resources and the establishment of guidelines for land use planning to ensure the sustainable use and management of renewable natural resources and the environment. It will be responsible for the adoption of proposed methodological guidelines and for providing political and legal support to the proposed legal and policy reforms.
MME (Ministry of Mines and Energy)	MME is responsible for formulating and implementing the national policy for the exploration, exploitation, transport, refining, processing, benefit, transformation, and distribution of

Stakeholders	Description of Stakeholders' Roles in Project Implementation
	minerals and hydrocarbons, as well as the policy on generation, transmission, interconnection, distribution, and establishment of technical regulations regarding electric power, the rational use of energy and the development of alternative sources. This Ministry will lead reforms in the Mining Code and will prepare best practices guidelines for restoration of areas degraded by mining.
UNDP	UNDP-Colombia will provide orientation, technical and administrative support, management tools, and theoretical as well as practical knowledge to national and regional institutions involved in project implementation.
UASPNN (Special Administrative Unit of National Natural Parks)	The UASPNN is responsible for the management and administration of the National Parks System and the coordination of the National System of Protected Areas (SINAP). It will be the entity in charge of implementing actions within the prioritized national-level PAs, and a key player in the development becoming that key actor in LMS construction processes in municipalities surrounding those protected areas.
Mining and Energy Planning Unit of the MME	Its purpose is to plan in a comprehensive, clear, permanent, and coordinated manner with public and private entities in the mining and energy sectors, the development and use of energy and mining resources to prepare, release, and disseminate required information on the sectors. It is play a key role in the incorporation of environmental considerations into mining policies.
ANLA (National Environmental Licensing Authority)	ANLA is in charge of projects, works, or activities subject to requirements of environmental licensing, permit, or procedures aimed to ensure compliance with environmental regulations, such a way they contribute to the country's sustainable development. ANLA will support the management with the CARs and will be part of the group of entities targeted for the capacity-strengthening actions to improve enforcement and project implementation. In addition, it will support the articulation of environmental management information systems, granting, and monitoring of licenses and mining rights, providing additional support to decision-making processes.
ANM (National Mining Agency)	ANM aims to achieve efficient and effective administration of mineral resources that are property of the State to promote the sector's productivity and competitiveness to maximize its contribution to the country's sustainable development. Its leadership in articulating mining and environmental information systems will be essential during decision-making, as well as in the participation of monitoring and control processes at the regional level jointly with environmental authorities.
CARs (CORPOURABA, CODECHOCÓ, and CVC)	The CARs will support the articulation of environmental management information systems, monitoring, and control of environmental licenses and mining rights, the formulation of land management plan, including conservation areas, and also land use planning the limitation for the assessment of indirect impact of mining activities in the areas they manage. Likewise, they will actively participate in training and capacitation events, as defined in the project.
Governor's Office of Antioquia	This entity is the highest mining authority in the department of Antioquia, as delegated by the MME, and is in charge of the administration of mineral resources that are property of the government within the department. Its participation in the project will be essential for coordinate actions to reduce the direct and indirect impacts of mining on BD and ecosystem services.
IIAP (Institute for Pacific Environmental Research)	This entity develops scientific and technological research aiming to contribute to the population well-being and development, to preserve the quality of the environment, and to use natural resources sustainably. IIAP will support actions at the regional and local levels for land use and sustainable use management. It will be an executing partner of the project, particularly in Component 2 for the conservation of BD in areas that are highly vulnerable to mining.
NGOs	Local NGOs will promote conservation and sustainable BD use. Most of their activities are consistent with the project's objectives. In the prioritized project area, NGOs like the Espavé Foundation (<i>Fundación Espavé</i>) and AMICHOCÓ will provide technical support to communities that are developing initiatives for alternative uses of the forest and its associated resources.
Municipal government offices (Vigía del Fuerte, Frontino, Murindó, Bojayá, Carmén del Darién, Riosucio, Tadó, San José del Palmar, and	The municipal government offices are local entities responsible for improving the quality of life for the population of their municipalities, by providing access to essential public utilities and promoting agricultural, livestock, and commercial development. Municipal government offices play a pivotal role in the incorporation of BD consideration into the management of land use through the preparation of POTs or EOTs.

Stakeholders	Description of Stakeholders' Roles in Project Implementation
Buenaventura)	
OIA (Indigenous Organization of Antioquia)	The OIA is a non-profit entity charged with representing indigenous communities and the department of Antioquia in order to ensure a dignified way of life, the well-being of the community, and the population's cultural survival. It will provide legal and technical support to indigenous communities in the project-related policies in the indigenous reserves.
ASOCASAN (Municipal Community Council of the upper San Juan River basin)	ASOCASAN manages the collective titles held by afro-Colombian communities in the municipality of Tadó where the project will be implemented. These communities have established internal regulations, land use zoning, biocultural guidelines, and are currently preparing an ethnic development plan. The local communities will be the direct beneficiaries of the project with regard to increased local capacity of governmental systems, planning activities, participation tools, REDD+, and others.
COCOMACIA (Municipal Community Council of the Integral Association of Farmers of the Atrato River basin)	COCOMACIA is orchestrating cooperation and technical support from different institutes to strengthen productive, organizational, and social aspects of BD and forest use and conservation in the region of the Atrato River basin. The organization will provide support to local communities in the implementation of sustainable use management system of NTFP and reduced dependence on mining activities
(WWF) World Wide Fund for Nature	WWF's mission is to stop the degradation of the planet's natural environment and to build a future in which humans live in harmony with nature. WWF will be the executing entity of the project, in coordination with national, regional, and local agencies; it would also lead Component 1 of the project with regard to the legal, political, environmental, and mining planning frameworks.
USAID (United States Agency for International Development)	USAID supports the efforts of the Colombian government, the private sector, and citizens to improve the living conditions of the vulnerable groups. It also provides options for social and economic development. USAID will support the development of the project through the BIOREDD program, aimed towards BD and ecosystem conservation as well as socially equitable and economically viable activities. USAID currently carries out REDD+ within the area of influence of the project.

18. **Participation mechanisms:** Three key phases for stakeholders' participation have been identified for the implementation phase of the project: planning, implementation, and evaluation: planning, implementation, and evaluation. **Project planning** will include annual meetings with key stakeholders including national and local governments, civil society, local communities (indigenous and afro-Colombians communities, and farmers), and co-financers, during which annual goals for each component of the project with established. These annual planning meetings will also serve to specify activities that will be financed through each source of co-financing.

19. **Implementation** of the project will be carried out according to annual plans that will be approved by the Steering Committee/Executive Board, which comprises: UNDP, MADS, IIAP, and WWF. The project director may invite other key stakeholders of the project to participate (for example CARs, municipalities, NGOs, community organizations) to guarantee active participation in complete representatives. Furthermore, key stakeholders will be direct beneficiaries of the project's activities such as training and PA management. The project design has taken into account opinions and points of view from members of communities that have participated in the project's socialization workshops since its PPG stage. This process of socialization and consultation with communities with continue during implementation.

20. **Project evaluation** will occur annually with the participation of key stakeholders at the end of each planning year and previous to defining the annual plan for the following year of project implementation. It is emphasized that the monitoring of the project and specific monitoring activities planned as part of the project strategy will be participatory in nature; these activities will include gender considerations in order to ensure the participation of both women and men and the equitable distribution of benefits and for which specific indicators have been included in the Project Results Framework (see Annex A). Also, mid-term and final evaluations will be carried out as part of the project cycle. Due to the independent nature of these evaluations, they will be key moments during the project's life when stakeholders,

including the local communities, local organizations, and government, can express their views, concerns, and assess whether the project's outcomes are being achieved, and if necessary, define the course of correction.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

21. The Chocó biogeographic region is one of the poorest and least developed areas of Colombia. Historically isolated from the rest of the country, Colombia's drive to grow economically and engage in global markets is driving the integration of the region into Colombia's economic and socio-political mainstream, potentially affecting the social fabric of the region.

22. The ethnic identity of indigenous and afro-Colombian communities is very closely linked to BD and ecosystem health, both of which are in turn threatened by the direct and indirect impacts of mining. The principal socio economic benefit of the project at the local level will derive from the avoidance and reduction of these impacts. The project will therefore aim to work with key social groups in the region represented by afro-Colombian community councils, and Indigenous authorities to develop actions that enhance their environmental management capabilities and to work collectively with Government agencies to protect their environmental and social interests. Capacity development measures targeting these authorities will amongst other things strengthen planning, administration, surveillance, and control of collective territories and protected areas, and put in place mechanisms to facilitate negotiation, conciliation, and conflict management on the part of these communities. Specifically, afro-Colombian and indigenous communities will be engaged from the beginning of the PPG phase through existing participatory mechanisms. In addition, indigenous and afro-Colombian communities found in the future multiple-use PAs will be consulted according to existing procedures and protocols used for the declaration of PAs in Colombia.

23. The project will develop in-situ conservation and sustainable use based livelihood strategies based on afro-Colombian and indigenous people's traditional knowledge of BD. In particular, it will develop a community based natural resource management system to safeguard wild resources likely to come under pressure from market demand, as the population of the Choco increases (an indirect consequence of mining development in the region). In addition, the project will benefit these communities by ensuring: a) the equitable distribution of benefits from earnings generated from the sale of forest credits in voluntary markets, potentially increasing the net earnings by US\$4 to 5 per tCO₂ eq/year; b) improving the forest management skills of local community members (including women) by training them in the principles and practices of REDD+ and BD conservation; and c) increase in income of men and women derived from the sale of NTFP (assai palm [*Euterpe oleracea*] and *jagua* [*Genipa americana*]). The UNDP gender marker will be utilized to ensure that gender considerations are fully addressed in all these endeavours. By protecting forest cover the project will help to reduce the vulnerability of communities to catastrophic flooding and other natural disasters as a result of the occurrence of extreme climatic events in deforested areas

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

24. A qualitative approach for identifying the alternative with the best value and technical feasibility for achieving the project objective was used in line with the GEF Council's guidance on assessing the cost-effectiveness of projects (Cost Effectiveness Analysis in GEF Projects, GEF/C.25/11, April 29, 2005).

25. Under the "business as usual" scenario, interventions will be implemented but will not make significant contributions to reducing the direct and indirect threats of mining, specifically the growing trends of gold, silver, and platinum mining exploitation in the Chocó biogeographic region, given that mining has become an important local unsustainable economic activity. Additionally, under the "business as usual" scenario, actions by the mining and environmental authorities that are directed towards controlling illegal mining and the development of alternative sustainable productive activities will continue to lack coordination, and the exchange of information (status of licenses, production volumes, current production status of mines, and the effectiveness of prevention, mitigation, and offset of the direct impact of mining activity on BD) will continue to be deficient.

26. The alternative GEF scenario will address the threats to BD from mining through a combination of public policy reforms, effective PA and land management, and conservation actions, as well as interventions in the mining sector that maximize the use of resources. This project has been developed using cost-effectiveness criteria based on a set of interventions that are necessary to safeguard BD in the Chocó biogeographic region from the direct impacts of gold,

silver, and platinum mining and from their indirect effects. The project will provide recommendations and guidelines for regulatory provisions with regard to mining and the environment at the national and regional levels. These will include actions to prevent, mitigate, compensate, and restore the impacts of mining activity on BD and their ecosystem services. The project will also promote capacity-building of national and regional organizations through strengthened and articulated information systems that facilitate the efficient exchange of information between environmental and mining authorities. This, in turn, will strengthen the decision-making process of the environmental and mining authorities and other stakeholders.

27. Also under the alternative GEF scenario local land use management instruments (POTs and EOTs) will incorporate BD considerations, improving municipal land use management policy and strengthening the regulatory and enforcement capacity of local organizations to ensure compliance, as well as the effective use and distribution of financial and human resources to deal with the indirect and cumulative threats of mining. This will include the development of specific control and management strategies for four PAs in line with their management plans, two management and sustainable use plans for indigenous reserves and collective territories of afro-Colombian communities, and two multiple-use PAs. In addition, two communities with collective land titles will be empowered during the project to lead conservation schemes that are compatible with REDD+ projects.

28. In addition, communities will reduce their economic dependency on mining activities with the development of sustainable use management systems for two NTFP. These initiatives will raise their income level and facilitate short- and medium-term economic decisions that contribute to the conservation of BD and its sustainable use. Last, a restoration pilot project of 100 ha of degraded ecosystems by mining activities will be implemented using restoration protocols developed by the MADS; this pilot exercise will be cost-effective in the long term as it will provide valuable information and lessons learned and will serve as reference for future restoration efforts at the regional and national levels.

29. Finally, the suggested actions will encourage the participation of local communities. This will enable different stakeholders to engage with one another, as well as coordinate actions related to the process of establishing the PAs, and the participatory management plan in two multiple-use PAs. This will reduce the monitoring and enforcement costs of the project areas as a result of local appropriation of the PA, which in turn increases their management effectiveness

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

30. Project M&E will be conducted in accordance with the established UNDP and GEF procedures and will be provided by the project team and the UNDP-CO with support from the UNDP/GEF RCU in Panama City. The Project Results Framework in Annex A provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The M&E plan includes an inception report, project implementation reviews, quarterly and annual review reports, mid-term and final evaluations, and audits. The following sections outline the principle components of the M&E plan and indicative cost estimates related to M&E activities. The project's M&E plan will be presented and finalized in the Project Inception Report following a collective fine-tuning of indicators, means of verification, and the full definition of project staff M&E responsibilities.

Project Inception Phase

31. A **Project Inception Workshop (IW)** will be held within the first three (3) months of project start-up with the full project team, relevant Government of Colombia (GoC) counterparts, co-financing partners, the UNDP-CO, and representation from the UNDP-GEF RCU, as well as UNDP-GEF headquarters as appropriate.

32. A fundamental objective of this IW will be to help the project team to understand and take ownership of the project's goal and objectives, as well as finalize preparation of the project's first annual work plan on the basis of the Project Results Framework, GEF Tracking Tool (BD-1 and BD-2), and UNDP's ESSP. This will include reviewing the results framework (indicators, means of verification, and assumptions), reviewing the appropriate next steps for environmental and social assessment and management, imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise, finalizing the AWP with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project.

33. Additionally, the purpose and objective of the IW will be to: a) introduce project staff to the UNDP-GEF team that will support the project during its implementation, namely the CO and responsible RCU staff; b) detail the roles, support services, and complementary responsibilities of UNDP-CO and RCU staff in relation to the project team; c) provide a

detailed overview of UNDP-GEF reporting and M&E requirements, with particular emphasis on the Annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and related documentation, the Annual Project Report (APR), as well as Mid-term and Final evaluations. Equally, the IW will provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP project-related budgetary planning, budget reviews including arrangements for annual audit, and mandatory budget re-phrasings.

34. The IW will also provide an opportunity for all parties to understand their roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference (ToRs) for project staff and decision-making structures will be discussed, as needed, in order to clarify each party's responsibilities during the project's implementation phase. The IW will also be used to plan and schedule the Tripartite Committee Reviews

Monitoring responsibilities and events

35. A detailed schedule of project review meetings will be developed by the project management in consultation with project implementation partners and stakeholder representatives and incorporated in the Project Inception Report. Such a schedule will include: a) tentative timeframes for Tripartite Committee (TPC) Reviews, Steering Committee (or relevant advisory and/or coordination mechanisms); and b) project-related M&E activities.

36. **Day-to-day monitoring** of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the PC based on the project's AWP and its indicators. The PC will inform the UNDP-CO of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely and remedial fashion. The PC will fine-tune the progress and performance/impact indicators of the project in consultation with the full project team at the IW with support from UNDP-CO and assisted by the UNDP-GEF RCU. Specific targets for the first-year implementation progress indicators together with their means of verification will be developed at this workshop. These will be used to assess whether implementation is proceeding at the intended pace and in the right direction and will form part of the AWP. Targets and indicators for subsequent years will be defined annually as part of the internal evaluation and planning processes undertaken by the project team.

37. Measurement of impact indicators related to global benefits will occur according to the schedules defined through specific studies that are to form part of the project's activities and specified in the Project Results Framework.

38. **Periodic monitoring** of implementation progress will be undertaken by the UNDP CO through quarterly meetings with the project implementation team, or more frequently as deemed necessary. This will allow parties to take stock of and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure the timely implementation of project activities. The UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF RCU, as appropriate, will conduct yearly visits to the project's field sites, or more often based on an agreed upon schedule to be detailed in the project's Inception Report and AWPs to assess first-hand project progress. Any other member of the Steering Committee can also take part in these trips, as decided by the Steering Committee. A Field Visit Report will be prepared by the UNDP CO and circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team, all Steering Committee members, and UNDP-GEF.

39. **Annual monitoring** will occur through the Tripartite Committee (TPC) Reviews. This is the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. The project will be subject to TPC review at least once every year. The first such meeting will be held within the first twelve (12) months of the start of full implementation. The project proponent will prepare an APR and submit it to UNDP CO and the UNDP-GEF regional office at least two weeks prior to the TPC for review and comments.

40. The APR will be used as one of the basic documents for discussions in the TPC. The PC will present the APR to the TPC, highlighting policy issues and recommendations for the decision of the TPC participants. The PC will also inform the participants of any agreement reached by stakeholders during the APR preparation on how to resolve operational issues. Separate reviews of each project component may also be conducted if necessary. The TPC has the authority to suspend disbursement if project performance benchmarks are not met. Benchmarks will be developed at the IW, based on delivery rates and qualitative assessments of achievements of outputs.

41. The **Terminal TPC Review** is held in the last month of project operations. The PC is responsible for preparing the Terminal Report and submitting it to UNDP-CO and to UNDP-GEF RCU. It shall be prepared in draft at least two months in advance of the TPC meeting in order to allow review, and will serve as the basis for discussions in the TPC meeting. The terminal TPC review considers the implementation of the project as a whole, paying particular attention to whether the project has achieved its stated objectives and contributed to the broader environmental objective. It decides

whether any actions are still necessary, particularly in relation to sustainability of project results, and acts as a vehicle through which lessons learned can be captured to feed into other projects being implemented.

Project Monitoring Reporting

42. The PC, in conjunction with the UNDP-GEF extended team, will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports that form part of the monitoring process and that are mandatory.

43. A **Project Inception Report (IR)** will be prepared immediately following the IW. It will include a detailed First Year/AWP divided in quarterly timeframes detailing the activities and progress indicators that will guide implementation during the first year of the project. This work plan will include the dates of specific field visits, support missions from the UNDP CO or the RCU or consultants, as well as timeframes for meetings of the project's decision-making structures. The IR will also include the detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation, prepared on the basis of the AWP, and including any M&E requirements to effectively measure project performance during the targeted 12-month timeframe. The IR will include a more detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions, and feedback mechanisms of project-related partners. In addition, a section will be included on progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation. When finalized, the IR will be circulated to project counterparts who will be given a period of one calendar month in which to respond with comments or queries. Prior to the IR's circulation, the UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF's RCU will review the document.

44. The **Annual Project Report (APR)** is a UNDP requirement and part of UNDP CO central oversight, monitoring, and project management. It is a self-assessment report by the project management to the CO and provides input to the country office reporting process and the Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR), as well as forming a key input to the TPC Review. An APR will be prepared on an annual basis prior to the TPC review, to reflect progress achieved in meeting the project's AWP and assess performance of the project in contributing to intended outcomes through outputs and partnership work. The format of the APR is flexible but should include the following sections: a) project risks, issues, and adaptive management; b) project progress against pre-defined indicators and targets, c) outcome performance; and d) lessons learned and best practices.

45. The **Project Implementation Review (PIR)** is an annual monitoring process mandated by the GEF. It has become an essential management and monitoring tool for project managers and offers the main vehicle for extracting lessons from ongoing projects. Once the project has been under implementation for one year, a PIR must be completed by the CO together with the project management. The PIR can be prepared any time during the year and ideally prior to the TPC review. The PIR should then be discussed in the TPC meeting so that the result would be a PIR that has been agreed upon by the project, the Implementing Partner, UNDP CO, and the RCU in Panama. The individual PIRs are collected, reviewed, and analyzed by the RCU prior to sending them to the focal area clusters at the UNDP-GEF headquarters. In light of the similarities of both APR and PIR, UNDP-GEF has prepared a harmonized format for reference.

46. **Quarterly Progress Reports** outlining main updates in project progress will be provided quarterly to the local UNDP CO and the UNDP-GEF RCU by the project team. Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform and the risk log should be regularly updated in ATLAS based on the initial risk analysis included in Annex 8.1 of the Project Document.

47. **Specific Thematic Reports** focusing on specific issues or areas of activity will be prepared by the project team when requested by UNDP, UNDP-GEF, or the Implementing Partner. The request for a Thematic Report will be provided to the project team in written form by UNDP and will clearly state the issue or activities that need to be reported on. These reports can be used as a form of lessons learned exercise, specific oversight in key areas, or as troubleshooting exercises to evaluate and overcome obstacles and difficulties encountered. UNDP is requested to minimize its requests for Thematic Reports, and when such are necessary will allow reasonable timeframes for their preparation by the project team.

48. A **Project Terminal Report** will be prepared by the project team during the last three (3) months of the project. This comprehensive report will summarize all activities, achievements, and outputs of the project; lessons learned; objectives met or not achieved; structures and systems implemented, etc.; and will be the definitive statement of the project's activities during its lifetime. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's activities.

49. **Technical Reports** are detailed documents covering specific areas of analysis or scientific specializations within the overall project. As part of the Inception Report, the project team will prepare a draft Reports List detailing the technical reports that are expected to be prepared on key areas of activity during the course of the project, and tentative due dates. Where necessary this Reports List will be revised and updated, and included in subsequent APRs. Technical Reports may also be prepared by external consultants and should be comprehensive and specialized analyses of clearly defined areas of research within the framework of the project and its sites. These technical reports will represent, as appropriate, the project's substantive contribution to specific areas, and will be used in efforts to disseminate relevant information and best practices at local, national, and international levels. Technical Reports have a broader function and the frequency and nature is project-specific.

50. **Project Publications** will form a key method of crystallizing and disseminating the results and achievements of the project. These publications may be scientific or informational texts on the activities and achievements of the project in the form of journal articles or multimedia publications. These publications can be based on Technical Reports, depending upon the relevance and scientific worth of these reports, or may be summaries or compilations of a series of Technical Reports and other research. The project team will determine if any of the Technical Reports merit formal publication, and (in consultation with UNDP, the GoC, and other relevant stakeholder groups) will also plan and produce these publications in a consistent and recognizable format. Project resources will need to be defined and allocated for these activities as appropriate and in a manner commensurate with the project's budget.

Independent Evaluation

51. The project will be subjected to at least two independent external evaluations as follows:

52. An independent **Mid-Term Evaluation** will be undertaken at exactly the mid-point of the project lifetime. The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency, and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation, and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, ToRs, and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The ToRs for this Mid-Term Evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP-CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF RCU. The management response of the evaluation will be uploaded to the UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). All GEF Tracking Tools for the project will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

53. An independent **Final Evaluation** will take place three months prior to the terminal Steering Committee meeting, and will focus on the same issues as the Mid-Term Evaluation. The Final Evaluation will also look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. The Final Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP ERC. The ToRs for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP-CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF RCU. All GEF Tracking Tools for the project will also be completed during the final evaluation.

Audit Clause

54. The project will be audited in accordance with the UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies.

Learning and knowledge sharing

55. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through a number of existing information sharing networks and forums. In addition, the project will participate, as relevant and appropriate, in UNDP-GEF sponsored networks, organized for Senior Personnel working on projects that share common characteristics. UNDP-GEF RCU has established an electronic platform for sharing lessons between the project managers. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Identify and analyzing lessons learned is an ongoing process, and the need to communicate such lessons as one of the

project's central contributions is a requirement to be delivered not less frequently than once every twelve (12) months. UNDP-GEF shall provide a format and assist the project team in categorizing, documenting, and reporting on lessons learned.

M&E work plan and budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$*	Time frame
Inception Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator UNDP CO UNDP GEF 	4,000 (GEF) 2,000 (CoF)	Within first two months of project start-up
Inception Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Team UNDP CO 	None	Immediately following IW
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP GEF Regional Technical Advisor/Project Coordinator will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members 	To be determined during the initial phase of implementation of the project and the IW.	Start, mid-point, and end of project
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversight by Project Coordinator Project Team 	No separate M&E cost: to be absorbed within salary and travel costs of project staff	Annually prior to APR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
APR and PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF 	None	Annually
Tripartite Committee Reviews and Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GoC counterparts UNDP CO UNDP GEF RCU 	None	Annually, upon receipt of APR
Steering Committee/Board Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator UNCP-CO GoC representatives 	2,500 (GEF) 4,000 (CoF) (1,300 per year)	Two times per year
Quarterly progress reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team 	None	Quarterly
Technical reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team Hired consultants as needed 	5,000 (GEF) 4,000 (CoF)	To be determined by Project Team and UNDP-CO
Mid-term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team UNDP- CO UNDP-GEF RCU External Consultants (i.e., evaluation team) 	44,000 (GEF) 20,000 (CoF)	At the mid-point of project implementation
Final Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team UNDP- CO UNDP-GEF RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	54,500 (GEF) 25,000 (CoF)	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Terminal Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Team UNDP-CO 	2,500 (GEF) 2,000 (CoF)	At least three months before the end of the project
Lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Coordinator and Team UNDP-GEF RCU (suggested formats for documenting best practices, etc.) 	7,500 (GEF) 4,000 (CoF) (2,300 per year)	Yearly
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNDP-CO 	29,250 (GEF)	Yearly

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Coordinator and Team • Auditors 	(5,850 per year)	
Visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP-CO • UNDP-GEF RCU (as appropriate) • GoC representatives 	No separate M&E cost: paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
TOTAL INDICATIVE COST (*Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses)		GEF	149,250
		CoF	61,000
		Total	210,250


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Aníbal Fernández De Soto	Vice Minister	ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	MARCH 22, 2012

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu , UNDP-GEF Officer-in-Charge and Deputy Executive Coordinator		December 18, 2013	Santiago Carrizosa, Senior Technical Advisor, EBD	+507 302- 4510	Santiago.carrizosa@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets by End of Project	Verification Sources	Assumptions and Risks
Project Objective: To safeguard biodiversity in the Chocó biogeographic region from the direct impacts of gold, silver and platinum mining and indirect impacts of mining [population growth and development of agriculture, forestry, fisheries and other sectors]	Area (ha) of four (4) existing protected areas (PAs) under sustainable management protects local ecosystems	- 0 ha	- 334,671 ha	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Management Plans - GIS databases and maps - Monitoring reports/databases - Official gazette 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decision-makers, including the mining sector, are willing to protect areas rich in BD against direct and indirect mining impacts - Environmental variability (including climate change) is within the normal range - Monitoring and control efforts are optimal
	Total area (ha) of forest protected by new multiple use PAs (MUPAs) against the impacts of mining	- 0	- 70,000 ha		
	Change in the management effectiveness of four (4) PAs according to the management effectiveness scorecard (METT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Las Orquídeas NP: 67 - Tatamá NP: 43 - Farallones de Cali NP: 53 - Munchique NP: 70 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Las Orquídeas NP: 87 - Tatamá NP: 63 - Farallones de Cali NP: 73 - Munchique NP: 80 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated METT scorecards - Project evaluation reports: mid-term and final evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interest is maintained by the national, regional, and local governments, local stakeholders, and the mining sector in improving PA management.
Outcome 1. The Policy, legal and planning framework in the mining sector addresses the direct threats to biodiversity from mining operations	National-level legal, policy, and planning instruments incorporate environmental and social criteria to prevent, mitigate, and offset the direct impact of mining activity on BD and ecosystem services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing legal, policy, and planning instruments: a) Mining Code; b) Environmental License required for mining operations; and c) Guidelines for the designation of mining reserve areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated legal, policy, and planning instruments with recommendations and guidelines incorporate environmental and social criteria to prevent, mitigate, and offset the direct impact of mining activity on BD and ecosystem services; a) the Mining Code; b) Environmental License; c) Guidelines for the designation of mining reserve areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposals for reform - Official gazette 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Political will exists - Legal feasibility exists
	Number of agencies from the mining and environmental sectors articulated in the unifying platform for	- 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental sector: 5 (UASPNN, IIAP, ANLA, CODECHOCO, CORPOURABA) - Mining sector: 1 (ANM) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standards and protocols for sharing information - Agreements for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Political will exists and agencies are willing to participate

	information systems (UPIS)			sharing data and access to the data – Number of data sets available in through the UPIS – Record of information queries																																																
Outputs:																																																				
<p>1.1. The Mining Code, Environmental License, and Guidelines for defining mining reserves include recommendations and guidelines to prevent, mitigate, and offset the impact of mining activities on biodiversity.</p> <p>1.2. The Mining Development Plan (PDM) or regional land use/environmental plans (Regional Environmental Management Plan [PGAR], POT, or Watershed Management Plan [POMCA]) includes the results of the Strategic Environmental Analysis (EAE) and considerations for the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>1.3. Existing information systems on environmental management conditions, licensing, and mining titles strengthen decision-making processes and facilitate compliance and monitoring of impacts on biodiversity.</p> <p>1.4. Training program institutionalized and at least 300 people trained by end of the project, targeting the National Environmental Licensing Agency, the National Mining Agency (ANM), the Mining and Energy Planning Unit (UPME), the Colombian Geological Service (SGC), Regional Autonomous Corporations, the UASPNN (Western Andes and Pacific Units), departmental governments, municipal councils, community councils, and indigenous councils and peasants working in the Chocó biogeographic region.</p>																																																				
Outcome 2. Protection of biodiversity in areas highly vulnerable to the indirect effects of mining	Number of municipal planning instruments (POTs) that incorporate conservation priority areas and zoning to address the direct and indirect impacts of mining on BD and ecosystem services.	– 0	– 5	– Protocols for monitoring and control – Technical reports and documents with recommendations for the incorporation of conservation priority areas and zoning	– Political will exists – Legal feasibility exists																																															
	Change in capacity to generate, use and share geographic, socioeconomic, and biophysical information needed for spatial planning and management purposes that take into consideration the indirect impacts of mining according to the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard (200 people trained: CARs, national-level	– Local level <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Espavé</th> <th>Asocasan</th> <th>Cocomacia</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a.</td> <td>2.00</td> <td>1.83</td> <td>1.33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b.</td> <td>1.33</td> <td>1.75</td> <td>0.83</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c.</td> <td>0.75</td> <td>1.38</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d.</td> <td>1.00</td> <td>1.00</td> <td>1.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e.</td> <td>1.00</td> <td>1.33</td> <td>1.33</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> – Regional level		Espavé	Asocasan	Cocomacia	a.	2.00	1.83	1.33	b.	1.33	1.75	0.83	c.	0.75	1.38	0.75	d.	1.00	1.00	1.00	e.	1.00	1.33	1.33	– Local level <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Espavé</th> <th>Asocasan</th> <th>Cocomacia</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a.</td> <td>2.40</td> <td>2.20</td> <td>1.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b.</td> <td>1.60</td> <td>2.10</td> <td>1.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c.</td> <td>0.90</td> <td>1.65</td> <td>0.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d.</td> <td>1.20</td> <td>1.20</td> <td>1.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e.</td> <td>1.20</td> <td>1.60</td> <td>1.60</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> – Regional level		Espavé	Asocasan	Cocomacia	a.	2.40	2.20	1.60	b.	1.60	2.10	1.00	c.	0.90	1.65	0.90	d.	1.20	1.20	1.20	e.	1.20	1.60	1.60	– Capacity Development Scorecard updated – Project evaluation reports – Training logs
	Espavé	Asocasan	Cocomacia																																																	
a.	2.00	1.83	1.33																																																	
b.	1.33	1.75	0.83																																																	
c.	0.75	1.38	0.75																																																	
d.	1.00	1.00	1.00																																																	
e.	1.00	1.33	1.33																																																	
	Espavé	Asocasan	Cocomacia																																																	
a.	2.40	2.20	1.60																																																	
b.	1.60	2.10	1.00																																																	
c.	0.90	1.65	0.90																																																	
d.	1.20	1.20	1.20																																																	
e.	1.20	1.60	1.60																																																	

<p>PA managers, municipalities, and community level organizations)</p> <p>a. Capacities for engagement</p> <p>b. Capacities to generate, access, and use information and knowledge</p> <p>c. Capacities for policy and legislation development</p> <p>d. Capacities for management and implementation</p> <p>e. Capacities to monitor and evaluate</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>IIAP</th> <th>Codechocó</th> <th>Munchique NP</th> <th>Farallones de Cali NP</th> <th>Las Orquideas NP</th> <th>Tatamá NP</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a.</td> <td>2.00</td> <td>1.67</td> <td>2.33</td> <td>2.67</td> <td>2.00</td> <td>1.33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b.</td> <td>1.50</td> <td>2.17</td> <td>0.83</td> <td>0.83</td> <td>1.33</td> <td>0.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c.</td> <td>1.75</td> <td>1.00</td> <td>0.75</td> <td>1.00</td> <td>1.50</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d.</td> <td>1.33</td> <td>1.33</td> <td>0.67</td> <td>0.67</td> <td>1.33</td> <td>1.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e.</td> <td>1.67</td> <td>2.00</td> <td>1.00</td> <td>1.67</td> <td>2.00</td> <td>1.67</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>- National level</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>ANLA</th> <th>ANM</th> <th>MME</th> <th>MADS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a.</td> <td>1.67</td> <td>1.33</td> <td>2.00</td> <td>3.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b.</td> <td>1.00</td> <td>1.67</td> <td>2.00</td> <td>1.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c.</td> <td>1.25</td> <td>1.50</td> <td>1.75</td> <td>0.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d.</td> <td>0.67</td> <td>0.67</td> <td>2.00</td> <td>1.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e.</td> <td>0.67</td> <td>1.33</td> <td>2.00</td> <td>1.67</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		IIAP	Codechocó	Munchique NP	Farallones de Cali NP	Las Orquideas NP	Tatamá NP	a.	2.00	1.67	2.33	2.67	2.00	1.33	b.	1.50	2.17	0.83	0.83	1.33	0.67	c.	1.75	1.00	0.75	1.00	1.50	0.75	d.	1.33	1.33	0.67	0.67	1.33	1.00	e.	1.67	2.00	1.00	1.67	2.00	1.67		ANLA	ANM	MME	MADS	a.	1.67	1.33	2.00	3.00	b.	1.00	1.67	2.00	1.50	c.	1.25	1.50	1.75	0.75	d.	0.67	0.67	2.00	1.00	e.	0.67	1.33	2.00	1.67	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>IIAP</th> <th>Codechocó</th> <th>Munchique NP</th> <th>Farallones de Cali NP</th> <th>Las Orquideas NP</th> <th>Tatamá NP</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a.</td> <td>2.4</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>2.8</td> <td>3.2</td> <td>2.4</td> <td>1.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b.</td> <td>1.8</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>1.6</td> <td>0.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c.</td> <td>2.1</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>0.9</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>1.8</td> <td>0.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d.</td> <td>1.6</td> <td>1.6</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>0.8</td> <td>1.6</td> <td>1.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e.</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>2.4</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>2.0</td> <td>2.4</td> <td>2.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>- National level</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>ANLA</th> <th>ANM</th> <th>MME</th> <th>MADS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a.</td> <td>2.00</td> <td>1.60</td> <td>2.40</td> <td>3.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b.</td> <td>1.20</td> <td>2.00</td> <td>2.40</td> <td>1.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c.</td> <td>1.50</td> <td>1.80</td> <td>2.10</td> <td>0.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d.</td> <td>0.80</td> <td>0.80</td> <td>2.40</td> <td>1.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e.</td> <td>0.80</td> <td>1.60</td> <td>2.40</td> <td>2.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Increase by 20% at all levels (3.0 is the highest score possible)</p>		IIAP	Codechocó	Munchique NP	Farallones de Cali NP	Las Orquideas NP	Tatamá NP	a.	2.4	2.0	2.8	3.2	2.4	1.6	b.	1.8	2.6	1.0	1.0	1.6	0.8	c.	2.1	1.2	0.9	1.2	1.8	0.9	d.	1.6	1.6	0.8	0.8	1.6	1.2	e.	2.0	2.4	1.2	2.0	2.4	2.0		ANLA	ANM	MME	MADS	a.	2.00	1.60	2.40	3.00	b.	1.20	2.00	2.40	1.80	c.	1.50	1.80	2.10	0.90	d.	0.80	0.80	2.40	1.20	e.	0.80	1.60	2.40	2.00		
		IIAP	Codechocó	Munchique NP	Farallones de Cali NP	Las Orquideas NP	Tatamá NP																																																																																																																																													
	a.	2.00	1.67	2.33	2.67	2.00	1.33																																																																																																																																													
b.	1.50	2.17	0.83	0.83	1.33	0.67																																																																																																																																														
c.	1.75	1.00	0.75	1.00	1.50	0.75																																																																																																																																														
d.	1.33	1.33	0.67	0.67	1.33	1.00																																																																																																																																														
e.	1.67	2.00	1.00	1.67	2.00	1.67																																																																																																																																														
	ANLA	ANM	MME	MADS																																																																																																																																																
a.	1.67	1.33	2.00	3.00																																																																																																																																																
b.	1.00	1.67	2.00	1.50																																																																																																																																																
c.	1.25	1.50	1.75	0.75																																																																																																																																																
d.	0.67	0.67	2.00	1.00																																																																																																																																																
e.	0.67	1.33	2.00	1.67																																																																																																																																																
	IIAP	Codechocó	Munchique NP	Farallones de Cali NP	Las Orquideas NP	Tatamá NP																																																																																																																																														
a.	2.4	2.0	2.8	3.2	2.4	1.6																																																																																																																																														
b.	1.8	2.6	1.0	1.0	1.6	0.8																																																																																																																																														
c.	2.1	1.2	0.9	1.2	1.8	0.9																																																																																																																																														
d.	1.6	1.6	0.8	0.8	1.6	1.2																																																																																																																																														
e.	2.0	2.4	1.2	2.0	2.4	2.0																																																																																																																																														
	ANLA	ANM	MME	MADS																																																																																																																																																
a.	2.00	1.60	2.40	3.00																																																																																																																																																
b.	1.20	2.00	2.40	1.80																																																																																																																																																
c.	1.50	1.80	2.10	0.90																																																																																																																																																
d.	0.80	0.80	2.40	1.20																																																																																																																																																
e.	0.80	1.60	2.40	2.00																																																																																																																																																
Area (ha) of degraded mining lands under restoration processes in areas key for biodiversity	- 0	- 100 ha	- Field surveys/notes - Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations	- Restoration protocols in place																																																																																																																																																
Number of new multiple-use PAs created	- 0	- 2	- Official gazette - PA establishment proposal and related documentation	- Willingness among decision-makers to establish new PAs - Consensus among local stakeholders for PA establishment																																																																																																																																																

	<p>Four (4) PAs with improved monitoring and surveillance in controlling access/resource use as measured by the METT.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Las Orquídeas NP: 2 – Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access/resource use - Tatamá NP: 1 – Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access/resource use - Farallones de Cali NP: 1 – Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access/resource use - Munchique NP: 2 - Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access/resource use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Las Orquídeas NP 3 – Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access/ resource use - Tatamá NP: 3 – Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access/ resource use - Farallones de Cali NP: 3 – Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access/ resource use - Munchique NP: 3 – Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access/ resource use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated METT scorecards - Project monitoring and evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations 	
<p>Avoided emissions (tCO₂-e) due to tropical rainforest deforestation at the end of the project</p>	<p>- 0</p>	<p>- 610,649 tCO₂-e</p>	<p>- C flow monitoring system reports</p>	<p>- Field/project reports</p>	<p>- Monitoring effort are optimal</p>
<p>Avoided deforestation (ha) at the end of the project</p>	<p>- 0</p>	<p>- 2,034.80 ha</p>	<p>- REDD+ projects feasibility analyses reports</p>	<p>- Project evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations</p>	<p>- Progress at the national level in the development of REDD+ and developing and implementing a system of social and environmental safeguards</p>
<p>Number of initiatives for the sustainable use of biodiversity in the marketing stage</p>	<p>- 0</p>	<p>- Two (2) NTFP: assai palm (<i>Euterpe oleracea</i>) and “jagua” (<i>Genipa americana</i>)</p>	<p>- Sale agreements/purchase orders</p>	<p>- Project evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations</p>	<p>- Proposed livelihood strategies are economically viable</p> <p>- Continued interest from local communities to</p>

	Change in the annual average income of the local community members (including men and women) derived from the sale of assai palm (<i>Euterpe oleracea</i>) and jagua (<i>Genipa americana</i>)	– 0%	– Women: X* – Men: X* Target will be estimated during the first 6 months of project execution	– Annual survey/field notes of the local community members income – Project evaluation reports: PIR/APR, mid-term and final evaluations	participate – Sampling efforts are optimal
--	--	------	---	--	---

- Outputs:**
- 2.1. Five Territorial Land Use Plans (POT) covering an area of 2 million ha delimit areas for development, including infrastructure placement, placement of settlements, farming, and forestry, taking into account BD importance.
 - 2.2. Enforcement capabilities of regulatory bodies emplaced: compliance monitoring with planning structures set out in the POT/EOT, PM, POMCA; protocols to strengthen coordination and the implementation capacity of regulatory and control agencies; aerial surveys and other surveillance measures to assess compliance; improved policing and prosecution of malfeasance.
 - 2.3. Management and control strategies for four national-level PAs (Tatamá NP, Las Orquídeas NP, Farallones de Cali NP, and Munchique NP) contribute to the reduction of indirect threats to BD associated with mining activities.
 - 2.4. Two sustainable use plans for Indigenous Reserves/Afro-Colombian territories that are affected by mining activities are incorporated into the management tools of the CARs to facilitate their enforcement by ethnic authorities.
 - 2.5. Gazettal of two (2) new multiple-use PAs covering 70,000 ha (legal gazettal and boundary demarcation).
 - 2.6. Strengthened institutional and community capacity for 200 people (know-how and equipment and other needs) for planning, administration, surveillance and control of protected areas.
 - 2.7. Two feasibility analysis for the development of REDD+ projects undertaken with at least two communities of collective territories.
 - 2.8. Sustainable use management system for non-timber forest products to address impacts derived from commoditization of the resources as a strategy for conservation and use of biodiversity products and reduced dependence on mining activities.
 - 2.9. One restoration pilot project (100 ha) to test the National Restoration Protocol (with co-financing from the IIAP).

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Reviewer's comments	Responses	Reference
Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion, April 2012.		
<p><i>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</i></p> <p>Please note that 20% increase in METT, maybe a good result or a very poor result depending on the baseline score. Please either commit to an actual METT score or defer committing to a METT target score until the CEO endorsement phase as you will have a baseline METT score at that time and can identify a more realistic target.</p> <p>Please ensure that by the time of CEO endorsement, the various outcomes in Component Two dealing with biodiversity status/condition including the areas currently undergoing fragmentation have appropriate biological indicators or threat reduction indicators in the logframe.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. During the PPG phase the baseline METT scores were established jointly with PA staff and officials from the National Parks System of Colombia (UASPNN). Additionally, METT targets were defined during the project's results framework workshop and in consultation with UASPNN officials. Accordingly, the METT targets were defined as follows: a) Las Orquídeas NP: increase from 67% to 87%; b) Tatamá NP: increase from 43% to 63%; c) Farallones de Cali NP: increase from 53% to 73%; and d) Munchique NP: increase from 70% to 80%.</p> <p>The full analysis of baseline METT scores is included as part of the GEF5 BD Tracking Tool (BD-1), which was completed during the PPG phase.</p> <p>During the PPG phase, a biological indicator was defined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Four (4) existing protected areas (PAs) under sustainable management protect 334,671 hectares (ha) of local ecosystems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CEO Endorsement Request: Part I, B. Project Framework; and Annex A: Project Results Framework - GEF5 BD Tracking Tool (BD-1)
<p><i>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?</i></p> <p>Please ensure that by the time of CEO endorsement that appropriate market analysis and studies are done to ensure the economic viability of the various strategies proposed: NTFPs, bush meat, etc., and that appropriate monitoring and enforcement measures are in place to ensure sustainable off-take.</p> <p>UNDP gender marker to be employed.</p>	<p>During the PPG phase, an assessment was carried out jointly with regional environmental authorities (CARs) and local community organizations to identify a sustainable use management system for wild resources harvested by communities that will contribute to reducing the indirect effects of mining. Among the different options, NTFPs were identified as the most cost-effective option since there is already some local experience with NTFPs and they have the highest potential to generate economic incentives to reduce threats to BD. As part of this selection process, feasibility analyses were conducted that included the following criteria: a) the threat of mining in the areas where sustainable use management system will be implemented; b) environmental benefits; c) social benefits; and d) economic benefits. Additionally, monitoring recommendations were made in order to ensure the integrity of tropical forest ecosystems in the areas where these initiatives will be implemented.</p> <p>Based on these criteria, three NTFPs were initially identified: assai palm (<i>Euterpe oleracea</i>), jagua (<i>Genipa americana</i>), and the palm tree <i>Oenocarpus bataua</i> (or <i>milpesos</i>). A market analysis was completed for each of these NTFPs and is included in Annex 8.9 of the Project Document. Based on these analyses, the assai palm and the jagua were selected to be included in the project.</p> <p>Additionally, during the PPG phase a gender expert from the UNDP Country Office was consulted to provide guidance about the gender component of the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CEO Endorsement Request: Part I, B. Project Framework; and Annex A: Project Results Framework. - Project Document; Annex 8.9. Feasibility of productive alternatives.

	<p>project in the implementation of sustainable production systems by local communities and to make suggestions about gender-based indicators. As result of this consultation, the following indicators were included in the Project Results Framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Increase in the annual average income of the local community members (including men and women) derived from the sale of two non-timber forest products (NTFP): assai palm (<i>Euterpe oleracea</i>) and jagua (<i>Genipa americana</i>). 	
STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF), date of screening: May 10, 2012.		
<p>1. The problem that this project will address is well presented; the main threats are clearly defined, as are the principal barriers to be overcome through the project's outcomes and outputs. The overall coherence and scientific logic is consistent. While mining is clearly the major driving force of economic and social change in the region recently, one other dimension that could be looked at more closely, however, would be the cumulative impacts of other sectors and land uses on biodiversity in addition to mining.</p>	<p>Thank you for your recommendation. During the PPG phase preliminary analyses were conducted to assess the impacts of other sectors and land uses on BD in addition to mining (e.g., agriculture expansion and development of infrastructure). However, the final project design only considers mining since it is currently a major threat to BD in the Chocó biogeographical region. It was determined that addressing other cumulative impacts of other sectors could disperse the efforts of the project to conserve and protect BD in mining landscapes in this region, given the limited available resources and timeframe for project implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – CEO Endorsement Request: Part I, B. Project Framework; and Annex A: Project Results Framework. – Project Document: Annex 8.9. Feasibility of productive alternatives
<p>2. While mention is made of the region's biodiversity's richness and uniqueness as a hotspot (e.g. Chocó³ region is considered to harbour the world's most biodiverse forests measured in terms of plant species richness and endemism), it is nevertheless difficult to distill the actual global environmental benefits that this project will specifically produce. For example, stating that "Biodiversity-friendly mining operations in over 4 m ha nationwide" will be a GEB is not sufficient. Neither is "Conservation status of threatened ecosystems and species improved, through better management of mining". While the benefits may be implicit, the anticipated benefits should be articulated in a considerably more explicit manner. The benefits should also be tied to specific locations as much as possible and should also consider the incorporation of ecosystem services and not principally species and area covered.</p>	<p>The global environmental benefits to be delivered by the project are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BD-friendly mining operations in over 2 million ha in eight (8) prioritized municipalities in the northern Chocó biogeographic region. 2. Two (2) new multiple-use protected areas (PAs) provide protection to over 70,000 ha of tropical forests. 3. Improved management effectiveness of four (4) national PAs (Las Orquídeas NP, Tatamá NP, Farallones de Cali NP, and Munchique NP) to address multi-sectoral threats over an area of 334,670.63 ha. 4. Improved habitat for BD, including the gray-bellied night monkey (<i>Aotus lemurinus</i>), pacarana (<i>Dinomys branickii</i>), neotropical otter (<i>Lutra longicaudis</i>), paca (<i>Agouti paca</i>), mountain tapir (<i>Tapirus pinchaque</i>), Chestnut Wood Quail (<i>Odontophorus hyperythrus</i>), Red-bellied Grackle (<i>Hypophyrrus pyrohypogaster</i>), Cauca Guan (<i>Penelope perspicax</i>), and Blackburnian Warbler (<i>Dendroica fusca</i>) 5. Emissions reduction from deforestation in 70,000 ha of tropical rain forests: 610,649 tCO₂ over a 5-year period (see Annex 8.11 of Project Document for detailed estimations). 6. Sustainable use of BD and ecosystem services in indigenous reserves/afro-Colombian territories in the middle and upper Atrato River basin and the upper San Juan River basin (northern Chocó biogeographic region). 7. Restoration of one hundred (100) ha of ecosystems degraded by mining activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Project Document: 3. Strategic Results Framework and GEF Increment.
<p>3. While the description of relevant baseline initiatives on the part of the</p>	<p>The indicators of the project's baseline principal elements were defined during the PPG phase and are included in the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – CEO Endorsement Request: Part I, B. Project

<p>government and others such as WWF is adequate, the baseline is weak in relation to the indicators of the project's actual principal elements. Since the project intends to also strengthen the management effectiveness of existing PAs, there should be METT scores for the baseline as a start. The lack of baseline data is recognized in the PIF and will need to be addressed during the project's further preparation.</p>	<p>Project Results Framework. Additionally, a description of the elements related to the management effectiveness and the financial sustainability of a set of four (4) PAs, as well as the capacity of the project's key national, regional, and local stakeholders, is included as part of the project's situation analysis (baseline of the project).</p> <p>During the PPG phase, the baseline METT scores and targets were defined together with the PA officials from each of the four prioritized PAs. Accordingly, PAs' management effectiveness will increase as indicated in the following: a) Las Orquídeas NP: from 67% to 87%; b) Tatamá NP: from 43% to 63%; c) Farallones de Cali NP: from 53% to 73%; and d) Munchique NP: from 70% to 80%.</p> <p>The full analysis of baseline METT scores is included as part of the GEF5 BD Tracking Tool completed during the PPG phase.</p>	<p>Framework; and Annex A: Project Results Framework.</p> <p>– Project Document: Section 1. Situation Analysis</p>
<p>4. In the further development of the project, more attention will need to be focused on how some of the proposed challenging reforms and desired results will actually be realized i.e. what the barriers to each may be and what will specifically need to be done to overcome them. For example, revisions are proposed for the Mining Code and the Land and Rural Development Law. REDD+ pilots are of course intriguing and will need to be carefully designed and monitored with good indicators. How to ensure that the benefits from carbon credits will be equitably distributed will be one case in point.</p>	<p>A detailed analysis of the proposed policy and legal reforms (and barriers) to be implemented by the project was performed during the PPG phase. As a result, all related project outputs were revised. For example, instead of mainstreaming BD considerations into the Environmental Impact Assessment Framework, the project will allow mainstreaming BD considerations into Guidelines for defining mining reserves. Similarly, the project will allow incorporating EAE results, with emphasis on BD and ecosystem services considerations, into national (PDM) or regional (e.g., PGAR, POT, or POMCA) mining/environmental planning instruments rather than into the National Mining Land Use Plan. The Rural Development Law was excluded from the project since currently this law is under discussion as part of the Colombian "peace talks," and there is no guarantee that a draft to include environmental/BD criteria in the Rural Development Law (or other related policy instruments) will be approved by the Congress. All the revisions and changes to the project's outputs are described in Part II, Section A.5 of this CEO Endorsement Request document.</p> <p>With regard to the REDD+ pilot project, during the PPG phase local communities were consulted who expressed their interest in learning more about REDD+ and its associated benefits. Thus, it is still necessary to assess the environmental, social, and financial feasibility of a REDD+ project (including the equitable distribution of benefits); these activities will be completed during the implementation of the project. The REDD+ project will be developed as part of the processes initiated by the BIOREDD-USAID project, which were identified during the PPG phase and are currently at different levels of design. The project will focus on supporting some of the stages that have not yet been developed and will include the following: a) analysis of relevant historic and current documentation; b) signing of agreements with communities and characterization of forests; c) carbon measurement and estimation of reduction of emissions; d) social analysis of interested parties; e) baseline estimation of deforestation; f) risk analysis, preparation of maps,</p>	<p>– CEO Endorsement Request: Part II, Section A.5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning.</p> <p>– Project Document: 2.4 Project objective, outcomes, and outputs/activities</p>

	<p>preparation of monitoring plan, and BD survey; g) contract with the assigned operator; h) site visits, design of mechanisms for the equitable distribution of benefits; and i) design and execution of a marketing strategy. At the end of the project, two communities with collective land titles will be able to lead conservation schemes that are compatible with REDD+ activities. The REDD+ methodology to be used will be chosen from approved methodologies, such as the Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) VM0015. The VM0015 methodology (Methodology for Avoided Unplanned Deforestation, v1.1) estimates GHG emissions from areas where unplanned deforestation is taking place and quantifies the emission reductions achieved by curbing deforestation. The methodology provides a comprehensive set of tools for analyzing both frontier and mosaic deforestation patterns to establish the baseline deforestation rate, monitor GHG emission reductions, and assess leakage. Estimations of VCUs considering the VM0015 methodology scenario for aboveground biomass for 70,000 of the tropical rainforests (90.94 tC/ha/yr)* indicate a total of 610,649 tCO₂-e avoided emissions due to tropical rainforest deforestation at the end of the project.</p> <p>*Based on data from the Colombian Environmental Information System (SIAC), available at: www.siac.gov.co.</p>	
<p>5. The description and assessment of risks is adequate for the most part although there is no mention of risks associated with climate change. Also, since the project requires a considerable amount of capacity building, this presents a risk as well and should also be represented in the table.</p>	<p>The risk associated with climate change was included, as well as the risk mitigation strategy. Similarly, the risk and the mitigation strategy related to the considerable amount of capacity building required for the project was included.</p>	<p>– CEO Endorsement Request: Part II, A.6. Risks and measures that address these risks.</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 150,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
1. Collection of baseline ecological information and verifiable biodiversity conservation targets and sustainable mining operations, including indicators to assess the delivery of multiple environmental benefits of the project	40,000	40,000	NA
2. Detailed threat and barrier analysis	10,000	10,000	NA
3. Analysis of policy and land use planning tools for incorporating biodiversity conservation criteria	25,000	25,000	NA
4. Stakeholder analysis, consultations and capacity assessment	25,000	25,000	NA
5. Development of feasibility analysis, budget and key project design elements	50,000	50,000	NA
Total	150,000	150,000	NA

⁵ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used): NA

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)