



Strengthening ecological connectivity in natural and productive landscapes between the Amistad and Darien biomes

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11209

Countries

Panama

Project Name

Strengthening ecological connectivity in natural and productive landscapes between the Amistad and Darien biomes

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

6/12/2024

Review completed by PM

7/9/2024

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

- a) **Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) **Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**
- c) **Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**
- d) **Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- e) **Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

- a) **Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?**
- b) **Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**
- c) **If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

5 B. Project Description

- 5.1 a) **Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how**

- they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?
- b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?
 - c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?
 - d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

 - e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?
 - f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?
 - g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?
 - h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?
 - i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?
 - j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?
 - k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?
 - l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF

financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?**
 - b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?**
- Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

5.4 Risks

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

NA

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Please ensure during project implementation, that the PIRs, the Mid-term Evaluation and Final Evaluation include an analysis and review of all dimensions of the Gender Action Plan and relevant gender dimension of the project.

7/24/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP response, 22 July 2024:

A text has been added to paragraph 78 of the CEO ER, paragraph 80 of the ProDoc, and Section 7 of the Gender Action Plan (GAP), incorporating the following description: *As part of the implementation of the Gender Action Plan (GAP) and relevant gender dimension of the project, this component will ensure that the PIRs, MTR and TE include an analysis and review of all dimensions of the GAP.*

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

NA

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

NA

Agency Response
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

NA

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response
8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)
a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response
8.3 Source of Funds
Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?
Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

In Annex E on Project Map and Coordinates, please insert the geographic location of the site directly under the dedicated data entry field in the portal.

7/24/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP response, 22 July 2024:

The table with project coordinates, based on the polygon of the intervention area, has been included in Annex E of the CEO ER and Annex 3 of the ProDoc. Also, annex 3.1 includes the shapefiles of the project landscape as well as in the dedicated data entry field in the portal.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified

sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Budget table: please change the expenditure category of UNDP direct project support costs of \$30,203 to Other Operating costs but not Sub-contract to executing partner.

7/24/2024

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP response, 22 July 2024:

The expenditure category for UNDP direct project support cost was changed to ?Other Operating costs? in Prodoc Annex 1 GEF budget Table and CEO ER Annex G, as requested.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

NA

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/9/2024

Please make the revisions identified in the review sheet and resubmit.

7/24/2024

Project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/12/2024

Please ensure during project implementation, that the PIRs, the Mid-term Evaluation and Final Evaluation include an analysis and review of all dimensions of the Gender Action Plan and relevant gender dimension of the project.

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/9/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/24/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		