



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	5642		
Country/Region:	Panama		
Project Title:	National Biodiversity Planning to Support the Implementation of the CBD 2011-2020 Strategic Plan		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5011 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$220,000
Co-financing:	\$140,000	Total Project Cost:	\$360,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Santiago Carrizosa

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes. Panama has ratified the CBD and is eligible for GEF BD funding.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * ¹	The OFP has endorsed the project. It was endorsed on July 31, 2013 by A. Herrera.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	Yes, UNDP's comparative advantage on the EAs are recognized.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? *	Yes. The project will be managed from UNDP's country office.
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A. EA is financed by FA set aside.
	• the focal area allocation?	N/A
	• focal area set-aside?	1/31/2014 Yes.

¹ Questions 2, 3, 4, 18 and 19 are applicable only to EAs submitted through Agencies.
EA review template: updated June 7 2011

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>11/29/2013 Budget numbers cannot be rounded. The total of the components is \$219,980, but the amount listed is \$220,000. Please fix this issue.</p> <p>Also, in section C please change the "Country name" to "regional" instead of Panama because funding for EAs comes from the Focal Area Set Aside and not national STAR allocations.</p> <p>The budget for the project (\$220,000) is within the benchmark for NBSAP enabling activities.</p>
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	Yes. It is well aligned with BD 5.
	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	Yes. Please see above.
	8. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes, NBSAP is a key national strategic document on biodiversity.
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>1/31/2014</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>11/29/2013 No. This project devotes significant resources to the implementation of the NBSAP, which is very important. However, there is no discussion of what will happen to the CHM website at the end of the project. Who will be responsible for maintaining it and how will it be funded?</p>
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>1/31/2014</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for the corrections.</p> <p>11/29/2013 No. While this project does well at outlining the problems with the current NBSAP, there is little information about how the capacities need to address these issues will be developed under this project, particularly in the context of Panama. What strategies will be used to develop these capacities and who will they focus on? Training workshops, online courses, etc.?</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	<p>1/31/2014</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for including gender mainstreaming in the staff TORs as well as in the body of the project.</p> <p>11/29/2013</p> <p>No. While acknowledging that women are often marginalized, this project does not include information on how they will seek to ensure the participation and inclusion of women.</p>
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>1/31/2014</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>11/29/2013</p> <p>No. There is minimal discussion about how CSOs and indigenous peoples will be involved in the development and implementation of the NBSAP.</p>
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes. It is aligned with the norm.
Project Financing	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	Yes.
	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes. It is aligned with the norm.
	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes.
	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	Yes, the government has identified \$140,000 of in cofinancing.
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	We note that there is no cofinancing from UNDP.
	20. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for financial management and procurement assessment.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Agency Responses	21. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 	

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	1/31/2014
		Yes.
Review Date (s)		11/29/2013
		No, please address the comments provided above and resubmit the revised proposal.
	First review**	November 29, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 31, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	

**** This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**