8 Latin America

Colombia

To examine the impact of conflict and fragility on environmental projects supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) in Latin America, the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) undertook an in-depth analysis of projects in Colombia.

The Colombian conflict has resulted in 220,000 deaths and 7 million internally displaced people—the highest number in the world—since the mid-20th century (Miroff, 2016). With roots in a decade of political turmoil known as *La Violencia* (1948–1958), the conflict involves several militant groups on both sides of the political spectrum. The Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) formed in 1964 and peaked in the late 1990s with close to 20,000 largely rural fighters motivated by a communist ideology against landholding elites. Adopting guerrilla warfare, FARC launched kidnappings, bombings, and other attacks on a quarter of the country's terrain. (Miroff, 2016). The National Liberation Army (ELN) has 3,000 fighters in remote areas of the northwest—students, Catholic radicals, and left-wing intellectuals with Marxist views like those of FARC against privatizing land resources (Colombia Reports, 2019). Other groups include the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), organized by right-wing elites in the 1980s and disbanded in 2006, and the splintered but pervasive BACRIM (criminal gangs), which contribute to the prolongment of the Colombian conflict (Steffens, 2018). Following the 2016 peace agreement between FARC and the Colombian government under President Juan Manuel Santos, FARC began to demobilize (Colombia Reports, 2019). However, Colombia remains plagued by conflict in the wake of the group's disbandment, including skirmishes among BACRIM gangs and between the government and existing organizations, notably ELN, that continue to carry out illegal drug and mining operations.

Environmental Background

The environmental scope of conflict in Colombia harmed primarily rural regions. The country is the second most biodiverse in the world, supporting ecosystems ranging from Amazonian rainforests to savannas and mountain highlands, and is home to 10 percent of the world's species (McDermott, 2015). The complicated dynamics and conflicting priorities of militant groups during periods of violence have damaged the country's natural biodiversity. Since the 1990s, FARC financed

DOI: 10.4324/9781003351399-10

much of its military operations by producing up to 70 percent of Colombia's coca, mostly for illegal drug trafficking (McDermott, 2015). The departments of Nariño, Norte de Santander, Putumayo, and Antioquia have supplied up to 90 percent of the world's cocaine (McDermott, 2015). In 2014, the U.S. government estimated that 112 thousand hectares had been converted to coca production in Colombia (McDermott, 2015). The U.S. State Department funded aerial fumigation campaigns in conjunction with the Colombian government to reduce illegal coca fields, but under former President Santos (2010–2018), the government halted the program in 2015, citing environmental and human health risks (Neuman, 2015). In addition to the narcotics trade, illegal mining of gold, emeralds, and coltan has reduced forest cover and compromised the quality of environmental resources, including water (Columbia University, 2018). Land mines have killed or injured more than 11,000 people throughout the country, second only to Afghanistan (Miroff, 2016). Following the 2016 peace agreement, scientists highlighted the need to improve environmental monitoring, institute science-based policy making, and implement strategies to protect natural resources, biodiversity, and climate-sensitive ecosystems (Columbia University, 2018).

The return to peace in Colombia brought its own environmental risks and challenges in long-neglected rural areas. In the year after the peace agreement, the government reported a 44 percent increase in the country's rate of deforestation (Reardon, 2018). In 2018, the Instituto de Hidrología, Meterología y Estudios Ambientales (IDEAM) recorded deforestation of 489,269 acres. Although lower than in 2017, that figure is still alarmingly high (Volckhausen, 2019). According to Global Forest Watch, a forest-monitoring platform, Colombia lost primary forests in 2018 at a rate 60 percent higher than in 2016 (Volckhausen, 2019). Most deforestation is in the Amazon basin, with the highest proportion (40 percent) in the department of Caquetá (Steffens, 2018). Today, in the absence of adequate funding and staffing in Colombia's environmental regulatory agencies, cattle ranchers have expanded into forested regions (Steffens, 2018). During the conflict, FARC published "cohabitation manuals" that set rough environmental guidelines, including limits on hunting and fishing and the amount of forest rural farmers could clear each year. FARC guerrilla activities, which drove mass human migration to cities during the conflict, may have unintentionally preserved 51,000 plants and animals (Columbia University, 2018). However, dissident FARC members may still be receiving extortion payments to purchase land for agriculture in the Amazon. These activities combined with coca cultivation, illegal mining, timber harvesting, illegal road construction, and forest burning continue to degrade native forests (Volckhausen, 2019). Although the country's biodiversity remains at risk, other peacetime studies have shown reasons for hope. For example, new species have been discovered in the forested areas of Medellín (Reardon, 2018).

GEF Involvement in Colombia

The GEF has funded 110 projects in Colombia to date, addressing issues from biodiversity loss to climate change. Many projects are regional, involving neighboring states in Latin America and the Caribbean, and 20 projects were global.

In Colombia, multicountry projects have focused on the challenges of conservation and opportunities for environmental management in diverse ecosystems, such as the Amazon rainforests, coastal and river ecosystems, the Andes Mountains, and urban environments. They have covered a range of sectors and stakeholders, from cattle ranching and coffee production to national strategies for climate change mitigation and toxic chemicals management, as well as international governance mechanisms to manage aquatic and other critical ecosystems. Some 40 percent of country-specific and regional projects (55) have addressed biodiversity issues, such as conservation of forests and crops. Another 29 projects addressed climate change, including initiatives on urban transportation and industrial energy efficiency. Of the GEF projects in Colombia, 89 full-size and 33 medium-size projects involved multilateral stakeholders and national government participation. To date, 46 projects have been completed or closed; 45 are still being implemented.

Using the methodology described in Chapter 2, ten projects in Colombia were selected for deep-dive analysis based on quantitative results from word searches for conflict-related terms and evaluation scores. The projects were then screened for relevance to the Colombian armed conflict and for GEF focal area representation. Table 8.1 lists the projects selected and the categories into which they fit. Few of the projects fell into the second or third categories; most substantially addressed conflict and received favorable evaluation scores.

Table 8.1 Colombia Projects Analyzed in Depth

ID	*Project Title*	*Focal Area*	*Project Dates*	*Category*
773	Caribbean archipelago biosphere reserve: regional marine protected area system	Biodiversity	2000–2005	1
774	Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Andes region	Biodiversity	2001–2007	3
794	Catalyzing conservation action in Latin America: Identifying priority sites and best management	Biodiversity	2000–2003	2
947	Integrated silvo-pastoral approaches to ecosystem management	Land degradation	2002–2008	1
1020	Conservation and sustainable development of the Matavén Forest	Biodiversity	1999–2005	1
2019	Integrated National Adaptation Plan: high mountain ecosystems, Colombia's Caribbean insular areas and human health	Climate change	2006–2011	1

(*Continued*)

Table 8.1 (Continued)

ID	*Project Title*	*Focal Area*	*Project Dates*	*Category*
2551 and 3886	Colombian National Protected Areas Conservation Trust Fund and Additional financing for sustainability of Macizo Regional Protected Area System	Biodiversity	2006–2015 2011–2014	1
9441	Contributing to the integrated management of biodiversity of the Pacific region of Colombia to build peace	Biodiversity, land degradation	2019–present	4
9578	Sustainable low-carbon development in Colombia's Orinoquia Region	Biodiversity	2019–present	4
9663	Connectivity and biodiversity conservation in the Colombian Amazon	Biodiversity, climate change, land degradation	2017–present	4

Note: Categories: 1. substantial conflict sensitivity and favorable evaluation scores; 2. limited conflict sensitivity and unfavorable evaluation scores; 3. substantial conflict sensitivity and unfavorable evaluation scores; and 4. ongoing projects that began after the 2016 peace accords, noting the peace agreement directly, and seek to align their objectives with government and UN peacebuilding policies.

Results

GEF projects selected for this in-depth review addressed diverse ecosystems and regions, from Colombia's Andes Mountains to the Amazon region to marine protected areas. Most focused on improving environmental outcomes for rural and indigenous populations, rather than urban areas. These projects primarily occurred from 2000–2010. Some were completed recently and three are ongoing. Analysis of the projects used the GEF evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and likelihood of sustainability.

Most evaluated projects received favorable overall ratings, meaning they directly and indirectly benefited local and global environments and human populations. Most benefits accrued to highly biodiverse regions of Colombia, especially for mostly rural populations. One such project supported the creation of one of the largest marine protected areas in the Caribbean archipelago, reducing conflicts between stakeholders such as indigenous and artisanal fishermen competing for marine resources with industrial and tourism sectors (GEF IEO, 2008a). This highly participatory project is an example of successful accomplishment of project objectives bringing about environmental, economic, and social benefits for involved populations. The project considered indirect pressures associated with the national conflict.

Of the few projects that received an unfavorable evaluation, Catalyzing Conservation Action in Latin America: Identifying Priority Sites and Best Management (GEF IEO, 2006a) failed to achieve a clear impact on national policy making, even though it generated biodiversity information across Latin America (GEF IEO, 2006b). Limited awareness of local contexts, such as conflict dynamics in Colombia's Chocó region, compounded by a lack of funding and of coordination between national agencies may have contributed to the results.

Relevance

A project's relevance refers to "the extent to which the intervention design and intended results were consistent with local and national environmental priorities and policies and to the GEF's strategic priorities and objectives, and remained suited to the conditions of the context, over time" (GEF IEO, 2019, p. 13).

Most GEF projects in Colombia, including those selected for in-depth review, received favorable scores for relevance to national and international policy frameworks. A project on conservation in Colombia's eastern Matavén Forest was rated highly satisfactory for relevance, with a focus on creation of an indigenous protected area in the central Matavén Forest that aligned with Colombia's National Biodiversity Policy, Strategy, and Action Plan under the Convention on Biological Diversity (GEF IEO, 2006b). The government also actively supported indigenous natural parks following international congresses. The project's implementing NGO, Fundación Etnollano, had long worked to integrate indigenous livelihoods and environmental conservation, and this project was part of that effort. The project not only aligned with national policies but also with governmental and nongovernmental groups' actions to protect the environment. Sensitivity to future risks of encroaching activities, particularly from ongoing conflict, motivated project design (GEF, 2000). The project documents specifically acknowledged that the project team expected "sporadic and temporary deteriorations" (GEF, 2000, p. 25) due to social conflict in the region and created a conflict resolution mechanism to limit stoppages.

One of the interviewed project staff said that friction between the national park authorities and indigenous people is common because "indigenous people believe that with the establishment of the national park, the community loses governance of the land." In evaluating the project, another participant affirmed that while the project "was not so successful in livelihoods, it hugely expanded the size of the Amazon frontier," enhancing biodiversity conservation in accordance with Colombia's National Biodiversity Policy. Other GEF projects aligned similarly with Colombian government policies on biodiversity conservation, climate change adaptation and mitigation, and sustainable development.

Effectiveness

The effectiveness of a project is the extent to which it has achieved its given objectives or the likelihood that they will be achieved (GEF IEO, 2019).

The projects reviewed are representative of the larger Colombia portfolio in that they are mainly aligned with GEF objectives to enhance biodiversity conservation in the country and Latin America more broadly. Selected projects also addressed issues of land degradation and climate change. Most of the projects that received effectiveness ratings had positive environmental effects, with only two lagging on short- and long-term effectiveness. A positive example is the project on silvo-pastoral agricultural systems in rural communities of Colombia, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica that had positive environmental and social outcomes. Project staff said that they did not consider conflict sensitivity in the project's design, instead relying on consultations with local NGOs familiar with the territory and the situation. This project was effectively scaled up to a national-level program, achieving local benefits, such as sustainable production and resource quality, and global environmental benefits, including biodiversity conservation and carbon sequestration (GEF, 2002).

In contrast, effectiveness was compromised in a project focused on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Andes region, owing mostly to a lack of leadership. The Alexander von Humboldt Institute, which, as a scientific institution, had limited leverage with government bodies, failed to engage key decision makers and failed to secure follow-on funding (GEF, 2001; GEF IEO, 2008b). Project staff reported that the project design did not fully consider the situation on the ground and the staff could not approach certain areas because of the strong presence of guerrilla forces. At the time, the Humboldt Institute was more concerned with biodiversity than livelihoods, yielding weaker results for the development component of the project.

Efficiency

The efficiency of a project refers to the extent to which the project "achieved value for resources, by converting inputs (funds, personnel, expertise, equipment, etc.) to results in the timeliest and least costly way possible, compared to the alternatives" (GEF IEO, 2019, p. 13).

Several projects in Colombia showed mixed results for efficiency in use of GEF funding. A pair of projects dealt explicitly with creating a national endowment fund to support conservation projects and were rated highly satisfactory (GEF IEO, 2015a, 2015b). Their success relied on Patrimonio Natural Colombia's sound financial management by its experienced and adequate staff. Assessments calculated high benefit-to-cost ratios for implementation of the projects overall. In contrast, the project on catalyzing conservation action, which received generally unfavorable evaluation scores, was rated moderately unsatisfactory for efficiency. GEF funding of the project took longer than expected, and delays cascaded due to participants' lack of coordination, which lowered administrative performance. The project also allocated insufficient funding for travel, technical expenses, and the dissemination strategy, affecting overall results (GEF Independent Evaluation Office, 2006a). In general, projects that were successful in effectiveness, impact, and sustainability were more likely to be rated higher in efficiency.

Sustainability

The sustainability of a project refers to "continuation/likely continuation of positive effects from the intervention after it has come to an end, and its potential for scale-up and/or replication" (GEF IEO, 2019, p. 13). Sustainability is evaluated along four dimensions: financial, sociopolitical, institutional, and environmental.

Projects rated successful in other evaluation criteria generally fared well in sustainability. One project began as a pilot, introducing silvo-pastoral agricultural approaches in certain areas, and was scaled up to a national-level program in the National Development Plan of Colombia (GEF, 2002). Other projects supported the creation of institutions and protected areas that led to increased resilience of local ecosystems and populations, supporting greater efforts in conservation. One of these, Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Matavén Forest, created the indigenous association ACATISEMA, which continues to guarantee local participation in decision making, safeguarding natural resources and local livelihoods against encroachment by conflict activities such as drugs production (GEF Independent Evaluation Office, 2006b). Although the pair of projects focused on the Macizo Regional Protected Area System received satisfactory ratings for financial sustainability, the evaluation noted that since the "peace process has still not been completed in Colombia . . . political issues therefore remain a concern" (GEF IEO, 2015b, p. 6). By contrast, the project on catalyzing conservation action performed unsatisfactorily for sociopolitical and institutional sustainability because it was not endorsed by national entities, local NGOs, and regional agencies and did not sufficiently disseminate information it produced to be used in policy design (GEF Independent Evaluation Office, 2006a). The project comprising pilot activities in climate change adaptation across several sectors and regions in Colombia had high cost-benefit analyses but did not create the financial resources to sustain activities after project closure, affecting its sustainability (GEF IEO, 2012).

Two completed projects stand out as sustainable catalysts for peace. The evaluation of the Caribbean Archipelago Biosphere Reserve project noted that the creation of a marine protected area and the development of a cooperative to manage sea resources between artisanal and industrial fishing reduced conflict in the years following project end (GEF IEO, 2008a). Another project established a prime example of a community-led conservation area and is now being replicated by other countries and indigenous organizations that have visited project sites after closure, increasing overall confidence in indigenous land governance (GEF Independent Evaluation Office, 2006b). A current project applies biodiversity conservation approaches to peacebuilding in a region prone to environmentally unsustainable interventions. As its project information form stated, it seeks to be a catalyst for long-term sustainability in mainstreaming biodiversity in peacebuilding (GEF, 2016).

Favorable evaluation ratings in the GEF Colombia portfolio reflected more effective, efficient, impactful, and sustainable results. The selected projects mostly included substantial mentions of conflict in design, implementation, and evaluation. These results could have correlated with favorable project ratings. Nevertheless, the correlation between these favorable evaluations and high conflict sensitivity, typical of projects selected for this deep-dive profile, is not conclusive.

Conflict Sensitivity

In terms of strategies for conflict sensitivity, most projects selected for this in-depth analysis acknowledged instances of conflict, either nationwide or in implementation areas. For example, one project, approved in 2006, described Colombia as a country under strong social conflict yet identified the opportunity to combine environmental and social goals through biodiversity conservation and sustainable use projects (GEF, 2006a). Overall, most projects identified the conflict dynamics as an eventual risk to project implementation. For example, two projects, one in the Andes and one in Matavén Forest, identified the conflict as a "significant" risk to project implementation (GEF, 2000, 2001). A third project was more specific, noting the risk that conflict would affect disease transmission rates in the health sector (GEF, 2006b). Most of the projects acknowledged conflict not only in project appraisal documents but also in socioeconomic and risk assessments prior to implementation. Three projects designed in and after 2016 directly acknowledged the peace agreement, seeking to complement government policies to strengthen peace (GEF, 2017, 2018, 2019).

A few projects not only acknowledged but also sought to mitigate conflict risks. Two strategies were avoiding implementing projects in areas of conflict (following the "do no harm" principle) and seeking to resolve conflict using such strategies as participatory design. The project Integrated National Adaptation Plan: High Mountain Ecosystems, Colombia's Caribbean Insular Areas and Human Health (2019) initially selected a site in Las Hermosas because it was assessed as being safe. Later, to avoid a delicate public security situation, the project identified two alternative sites for its climate adaptation plans, a shift during project implementation. In another project, certain areas such as high mountain zones were rejected before project implementation for posing security risks, and foothill areas were selected because they had "reasonable conditions of security" (GEF, 2002, p. 111). Most projects sought to involve local and indigenous stakeholders directly using participatory design. The project on the Colombian National Protected Areas Conservation Trust Fund involved inclusive work with buffer zone and rural communities "designed to be successful" in the midst of the conflict (GEF, 2005, p. 4), while the current project on connectivity and biodiversity conservation seeks to enhance consultations with relevant stakeholders, such as indigenous communities, to achieve a "shared view of the territory" and improve institutional capacity in the Colombian Amazon (GEF, 2017, p. 12). The current project on sustainable low-carbon development takes a similar approach in the Orinoquia region (GEF, 2019). Project design for two ongoing projects paid attention to UN Department of Safety and Security guidelines to protect project staff from conflict-related risks (GEF, 2017, 2018).

GEF projects designed or implemented after the 2016 peace agreement between the Colombian government and FARC are more conflict sensitive. The three studied projects designed after the 2016 agreement and still being implemented as of 2022 include peacebuilding to various degrees. One is the only GEF-funded project in Colombia to mention peacebuilding in its title; it notes not only Colombia's

progress through the peace agreement but also the opportunities and challenges for Pacific regional development as a precursor to achieve peace (GEF, 2018). The project seeks to apply conservation practices in the post-agreement, peacebuilding context of Colombia, noting that "providing alternatives for returning populations will promote peace" (GEF, 2016, p. 18).

The current project that seeks to mainstream peacebuilding through environmental conservation in the Amazon region is yielding positive results. Project staff said the Colombian government requested the project as the peace agreement was being negotiated to have an operational project in the Amazon. Working in such FARC-controlled areas was unthinkable before the peace agreement. The project is working on low-carbon development to improve livelihoods, employing local communities and reintegrating ex-combatants. Although it is too early to conclude whether livelihoods have improved, the project aligns with the government's peacebuilding policies and seems to be strengthening the social fabric of a region that had been at the heart of the conflict.

The third current project, on sustainable low-carbon development, is also being implemented in a region that had been a hub of conflict. It is designed explicitly to complement government peacebuilding policies, such as improving state presence in the region through sustainable development (GEF, 2019). A precursor project that closed in 2015 said of the country context, "The project may provide some support to the peace process by supporting pilot initiatives on the sustainable use of biodiversity" (GEF, 2006a, p. 25). It acknowledged that the local executing agency, Unidad Administrativa Especial del Sistema de Parques Nacionales Naturales, a special administrative unit of the national natural parks system, "continues to work in the midst of the conflict" and is "convinced that environmental themes may contribute to the solution of the armed conflict in Colombia" (GEF, 2006a, p. 25).

The project Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Sustainable Cattle Ranching, although not analyzed in depth, is another "excellent example of a contribution to the post-conflict healing and development process" in areas where armed forces had regained control (GEF, 2009, p. 59). This aligns with Colombia's priorities for "Total Peace" policy.

Since the peace agreement, project planners and staff have had to avoid fewer sites. The three active projects described earlier are in areas previously avoided because of security concerns. One is in the Pacific region of Colombia with ELN presence. Another includes vast areas of the Amazon region, where project staff had reported in the past that implementing a project was impossible, let alone attempting to improve institutional capacity. Political willingness from both the government and FARC to address socioenvironmental issues of biodiversity and livelihoods enabled project implementation. Thanks to the project, environmental authorities are slowly moving into these areas, building confidence, promoting community work, and establishing dialogue. For the third, the FARC-EP was present throughout the Orinoquia Department, controlling the territory and its resources (GEF, 2019). This project, aligning with Colombia's National Development Plan, seeks to use low-carbon development through strategies that are part of the peace consolidation process (GEF, 2019).

The GEF-funded Colombia projects selected for this in-depth review cannot account for the full diversity of aims and results of all projects in the country's portfolio. Of 110 projects, most lacked evaluations necessary to provide ratings for analysis. However, the selected projects generally represent the 27 that did receive ratings that correlated with substantial mentions of conflict terms. Based on the small sample size, conflict sensitivity cannot be said to have led to more favorable outcomes on environmental and other indices. Nor can it be concluded that favorable outcomes depend on sensitivity to Colombian and other conflicts. However, more successful projects did seem to exhibit more comprehensive assessments of the national context, including risks of conflict. They also showed substantive and deliberate engagement of various stakeholders, using, for example, participatory design, and demonstrated strong ambitions to integrate environmental and other social, humanitarian, health, or conflict-related goals.

References

Colombia Reports. (2019, July 20). *Colombia's illegal armed groups (maps)*. https://colombiareports.com/colombia-illegal-armed-groups-maps/

Columbia University. (2018, September 12). End of Colombia conflict may bring new threats to ecosystems. *Phys.org*. https://phys.org/news/2018-09-colombia-conflict-threats-ecosystems.html

GEF. (2000). *Project document for CEO approval* [Conservation and sustainable development of the Mataven Forest, Project 1020]. https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/1020

GEF. (2001). *Project appraisal document (for CEO endorsement)* [Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Andes region, Project 774]. https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/774

GEF. (2002). *Project appraisal document* [Integrated silvo-pastoral approaches to ecosystem management, Project 947]. https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/947

GEF. (2005). *Executive summary (Revised)* [Colombian national protected areas conservation trust fund, Project 2551]. https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/2551

GEF. (2006a). *Project appraisal document (for CEO Endorsement)* [Colombian national protected areas conservation trust fund, Project 2551]. https://publicpartnershipdata.azureedge.net/gef/PMISGEFDocuments/Biodiversity/Colombia%20-%20Colombian%20National%20Protected%20Areas%20Conservation%20Trust%20Fund/02-24-06%20Project%20Document.pdf

GEF. (2006b). *Project appraisal document (for CEO Endorsement)* [Integrated national adaptation plan: High mountain ecosystems, Colombia's Caribbean insular areas and human health (INAP), Project 2019]. https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/2019

GEF. (2009). *Project document (for CEO endorsement)* [Mainstreaming biodiversity in sustainable cattle ranching, Project 3574]. https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/3574

GEF. (2016). *PIF document for WPI (revised)* [Contributing to the integrated management of biodiversity of the Pacific region of Colombia to Build Peace, Project 9441]. https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/9441

GEF. (2017). *Project appraisal document (revised)* [Colombia: Connectivity and biodiversity conservation in the Colombian Amazon, Project 9663]. https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/9663

GEF. (2018). *Project document* [Contributing to the integrated management of biodiversity in the Pacific region of Colombia to build peace, Project 9441]. https://publicpartnershipdata.azureedge.net/gef/GEFDocuments/05d7ed57-df7c-e811-8124-3863bb2e1360/Roadmap/Agencyprojectdocument_Prodoc%20Colombia%20Pacific%2020Nov2018%20FINAL-CLEAN.docx

GEF. (2019). *Project information document* [Sustainable low carbon development in Colombia's Orinoquia Region, Project 9578]. https://www.thegef.org/projects-operations/projects/9578

GEF Independent Evaluation Office. (2006a). *Terminal evaluation review* [Catalyzing conservation action in Latin America: Identifying priority sites and best management, Project 794]. https://www.gefieo.org/sites/default/files/documents/projects/tes/794-terminal-evaluation.pdf

GEF Independent Evaluation Office. (2006b). *Terminal evaluation review* [Conservation and sustainable development of the Matavén Forest, Project 1020]. https://www.gefieo.org/data-ratings/projects/project-id-1020

GEF Independent Evaluation Office. (2008a). *Terminal evaluation review* [Caribbean archipelago biosphere reserve: Regional marine protected area system, Project 773]. https://www.gefieo.org/data-ratings/projects/project-id-773

GEF Independent Evaluation Office. (2008b). *Terminal evaluation review* [Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Andes region, Project 774]. https://www.gefieo.org/data-ratings/projects/project-id-774

GEF Independent Evaluation Office. (2012). *Implementation completion and results report* [Integrated national adaptation plan: High mountain ecosystems, Colombia's Caribbean insular areas and human health (INAP), Project 2019]. https://www.gefieo.org/data-ratings/projects/project-id-2019

GEF Independent Evaluation Office. (2015a). *Implementation completion and results report* [Colombian national protected areas conservation trust fund, Project 2551]. https://www.gefieo.org/data-ratings/projects/project-id-2551

GEF Independent Evaluation Office. (2015b). *Terminal evaluation review* [Colombia national protected areas conservation trust fund—Additional financing for the sustainability of the Macizo regional protected area system (SIRAPM), Project 3886]. https://www.gefieo.org/data-ratings/projects/project-id-3886

GEF Independent Evaluation Office. (2019). *The GEF evaluation policy, policies & guidelines*. https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/gef-evaluation-policy

McDermott, J. (2015, May 6). Is Colombia again the world's top cocaine producer? *InSight Crime*. https://www.insightcrime.org/news/analysis/colombia-again-world-top-cocaine-producer/.

Miroff, N. (2016, August 24). The staggering toll of Colombia's war with FARC rebels, explained in numbers. *Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2016/08/24/the-staggering-toll-of-colombias-war-with-farc-rebels-explained-in-numbers/

Neuman, W. (2015, May 15). Defying U.S., Colombia halts aerial spraying of crops used to make cocaine. *New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/15/world/americas/colombia-halts-us-backed-spraying-of-illegal-coca-crops.html

Reardon, S. (2018, June 12). FARC and the forest: Peace is destroying Colombia's jungle–and opening it to science. *Nature*. https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-05397-2

Steffens, G. (2018, May 3). In the Colombian Amazon, peace has environmental consequences. *The World*. https://www.pri.org/stories/2018-05-03/colombian-amazon-peace-has-environmental-consequences

Volckhausen, T. (2019, July 16). Deforestation in Colombia finally dips three years after FARC peace deal. *Pacific Standard*. https://psmag.com/environment/deforestation-in-colombia-finally-dips-three-years-after-farc-peace-deal