



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4780		
Country/Region:	Panama		
Project Title:	Promoting the application of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing in Panama		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4897 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	NPIF	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,000,000
Co-financing:	\$3,422,000	Total Project Cost:	\$4,422,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	12/09/2011

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		12-09-11 Yes. Panamá is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		12-09-11 Yes. UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) with support from the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) in Panama City. A Regional Technical Adviser from the Environment and Energy Group will oversee the project. Cleared.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		12-09-11 Yes. Described in C.2 of PIF. Cleared
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		NA
	• the focal area allocation?		NA
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		NA
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	12-06-11 Yes. This is a MSP (\$1,000,000) and is within the funding available at the NPIF. Cleared	
	• focal area set-aside?		NA
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		12-09-11 Yes. The PIF is aligned with the NPIF. Cleared
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		12-09-11 Yes. The relevant BD objectives are identified. Cleared
	9. 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?		12-09-11 Yes. Addressed in PIF. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		12-09-11 Yes. The institutional and human capacities developed through this project will be carried out and maintained by the national participating institutions (i.e. University of Panama, INDICASAT and ANAM). Cleared
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?		12-09-11 The baseline project is properly described in B.1. Cleared.
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		12-09-11 The cost-effectiveness was addressed in the PIF. The engagement of the private sector makes this PIF potentially very cost-effective, compared to bio-prospecting without a buyer in sight. Cleared
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?		12-09-11 Yes. Activities are concentrated in bio-prospecting, technology transfer, sharing of benefits with the National park service and the Panamanian authority. Cleared
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		12-09-11 Yes. The project has the following components: 1.Discovering active compounds for pharmaceutical and agrochemical uses from organisms in protected areas 2.Transfer of technology and practices

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>to facilitate the discovery of active compounds and the sustainable use of biodiversity</p> <p>3.Benefits shared with national parks and the Panamanian population</p> <p>4.Increased national capacity on ABS</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		<p>12-09-11</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	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?		<p>12-09-11</p> <p>This is Component 3 of the project. There are also elements in Components 1,2 and 4.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		<p>12-09-11</p> <p>This ABS project will be sources from a Marine Protected Area (Coiba National Park). No indigenous peoples occupy this park.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)		<p>12-09-11</p> <p>Addressed in B.4 in MSP.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		<p>12-09-11</p> <p>Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		12-09-11 Yes. The project will Implemented and Executed by UNDP. Other executing agencies include the National Environment Authority (ANAM), the Institute of Advanced Scientific Investigations and High Technology Services (INDICASAT), INDICASAT, Universidad de Panama and Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute (co-financing and facilitator institution. Not to receive GEF funding). Cleared
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		NA
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		12-09-11 Yes. The project management cost is \$52,700, which is 5.27% of the GEF grant. Cleared
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		12-09-11 Yes. Cleared
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		12-09-11 Co-financing is \$3,422,000 from: The National Institutes of Health, Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, US Department of Agriculture, INDICASAT, University

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			of California, University of Utah, Eisai Inc., Centauri Technologies Corporation, and Dow AgroScience. Cleared
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		12-09-11 UNDP had already committed all its co-financing when engaged with the Government of Panama to do this project. Cleared
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		NA
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		12-09-11 Yes. Pages 4-6 and Annex A. Cleared
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		12-09-11 Yes. This MSP is recommended for approval.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Review Date (s)	First review*		December 09, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.