



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	10023		
Country/Region:	Panama		
Project Title:	Development of the National Framework for Climate Transparency of Panama		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CBIT-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$850,000
Co-financing:	\$150,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,000,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Milena Vasquez	Agency Contact Person:	Geordie Colville

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	MGV, April 3, 2018: Yes, this project is aligned with the CBIT Programming Directions.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV, April 3, 2018: Yes, this project is aligned with Panama's NDC and other national plans and legislation.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	MGV, April 3, 2018: a) Please add information regarding the ratification of the Paris Agreement	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>and details of Panama's NDC under part 1 to complement the included information, even if it is included later in part 6.</p> <p>b) There is information regarding the way in which the initial national communications have been developed with international consultants, but no complementary information on the Third National Communication and First Biennial Update Report project currently under implementation with UNDP. Please provide additional information, including current status, institutional arrangements, capacity-built, etc particularly as it regards Panama's first BUR.</p> <p>c) The National System for Environmental Data (SINIA) is introduced in p. 8. Please provide additional information of the SINIA under baseline scenario.</p> <p>MGV, May 31, 2018: All comments have been addressed.</p> <p>a) Information on the ratification of the Paris Agreement and Panama's NDC has been added. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) Additional information on existing capacities and institutional arrangements, including for the TNC and first BUR project has been added. Comment cleared.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		c) Additional information on the SINIA has been provided. Comment cleared.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>MGV, April 3, 2018:</p> <p>a) While there is very clear information on identified gaps, as the project will focus specifically on the energy and AFOLU sectors, the PIF would benefit from more specific discussion of the existing capacities and arrangements, as well as gaps and needs in those two sectors as it relates to GHG inventories, activity data, emission factors, tracking of mitigation and adaptation actions, and tracking of support received and needed.</p> <p>b) There is mention of the lack of communication between the national and city level to integrate and report climate information, but it is not clear how the project will address that. It would be interesting if this something that is explored through the project more explicitly, in particular with the capital.</p> <p>c) Academia and research institutions are notably missing as stakeholders. We suggest relevant institutions are included, especially considering Panama has an important scientific role in the region (for example, CATHALAC, Smithsonian, etc.).</p> <p>d) Part 4 would benefit from some</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>explanation on why this type of integrated national framework has not been supported before. It would also benefit from additional information on how this project will be complementary to the work under the UNFCCC Regional Center for Collaboration.</p> <p>MGV, May 31, 2018: All comments have been addressed.</p> <p>a) Additional information on existing capacities and arrangements for the energy and AFOLU sectors has been added. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) This will be specifically explored in Component 1. Comment cleared.</p> <p>c) Information on the role of CATHALAC as well as in general academic and research institutions has been added. Comment cleared.</p> <p>d) Part 4 now includes information on the complementarity with the work to be carried out by the Carbon Pricing Project of the RCC UNFCCC that will develop a National Registry of Emissions. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>MGV, April 3, 2018:</p> <p>a) Does the SINIA utilize already an existing web platform? If not, please explain what is meant by having Panama Reports integrated with the SINIA.</p> <p>b) What other activity data are</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>expected to be enhanced under Output 1.2? How have these been prioritized?</p> <p>c) There is no mention of IPCC guidelines. Please ensure that methodologies, guidelines and tools will be consistent with relevant IPCC guidelines and best practices.</p> <p>d) Under Output 1.2 there is no discussion of the part of the project that will focus on means of implementation. Please clarify how this will be addressed.</p> <p>e) How will the public engagement mechanism involve indigenous people, which as was explained in p. 7 have been out of reach and budget from the Ministry of Environment in the past?</p> <p>MGV, May 31, 2018: All comments have been addressed.</p> <p>a) The SINIA does utilize a web platform. Comment cleared.</p> <p>b) Additional information on activity data to be enhanced has been added. These were prioritized by identified gaps while preparing the Third National Communication. Comment cleared.</p> <p>c) References to IPCC guidelines have been added. Comment cleared.</p> <p>d) Means of implementation will be addressed through Activity 1.2.1 and will be further elaborated by CEO</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Endorsement. Comment cleared. e) The stakeholders section as well as the component on public engagement now specifies that it will involve indigenous people in a way similar to how it was done during REDD+ strategy. Comment cleared.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV, April 3, 2018: Ok. Additional information will be provided by CEO Endorsement. See above comment on including additional stakeholders.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	MGV, April 3, 2018: N/A This project is requesting resources form the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	MGV, April 3, 2018: N/A This project is requesting resources form the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	MGV, April 3, 2018: N/A This project is requesting resources form the CBIT Trust Fund.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MGV, April 3, 2018: Not yet. Please address comments above. MGV, May 31, 2018: All comments have been addressed. PM recommends CEO PIF Approval.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Review Date	Review	April 03, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 31, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		