

# Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel



The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility (Version 4)

## STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: September 26, 2007

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Stocking

### I. PIF Information

**Full size project**      **GEF Trust Fund**

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID:**

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:**

**COUNTRY(IES):** Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Vietnam

**PROJECT TITLE:** Development and application of decision-support tools to conserve and sustainably use genetic diversity in indigenous livestock and wild relatives

**GEF AGENCY(IES):** UNEP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Bangladesh Agricultural University, Department of Animal Breeding and Genetics; Pakistan Agricultural Research Council, Animal Sciences Division; University of Peradeniya, Department of Animal Science, Sri Lanka; National Institute of Animal Husbandry, Vietnam; International Livestock Research Institute, Nairobi

**GEF FOCAL AREA (S):** Biodiversity

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):** BD-SP 4, 5

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:** Biodiversity

### II. STAP PIF Screening (based on Part I A Project Framework and Part II Questions of the PIF)

#### Background logical consistency informing STAP's scientific and technical screening:

1. Is the Project Objective consistent with the Problem/Issue?      YES  NO  PARTIAL   
- If "No" or "Partial" explain:
2. Are the expected outcomes consistent with the Problem/Issue? YES  NO  PARTIAL   
- If "No" or "Partial" explain:
3. Global environmental benefits scientifically valid? YES  NO  UNKNOWN   
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain: *The PIF does not state how the global impacts will be monitored, or what targets will be developed in delivery of the global environment benefits.*

#### Relevant Scientific and Technical issues contained in proponent responses to Questions A to H

4. Problem definition scientifically valid?      YES  NO  UNKNOWN   
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain:
5. Proposed intervention scientifically justified?      YES  NO  UNKNOWN   
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain:
6. Methodology proposed:
  - Is there a scientifically valid baseline?      YES  NO  UNKNOWN
  - Is a scientific control explicitly included?      YES  NO  UNKNOWN  N/A
  - Is there scientific or technical innovation?      YES  NO  UNKNOWN
  - Is the methodology replicable?      YES  NO  UNKNOWN

- If any of the above are marked "No" or "Unknown" explain: *No baseline is included in the project.*

*Control groups do not apply. The project is not innovative.*

7. Is the incremental reasoning scientifically valid?      YES  NO  UNKNOWN   
- If "No" or "Unknown" explain: *The PIF does not define how the global environment benefits will be monitored, or delivery tracked.*
8. Are the risk statements scientifically valid      YES  NO  UNKNOWN   
and comprehensive? *If "No" explain: Political instability may be another risk.*

### III. STAP Advisory Response (see next page for explanation)

9. Based on this PIF screening, STAP recommends the following action to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency (ies): **No Objection**

### IV. Further guidance from STAP

10. STAP has no objection to this proposal. However, STAP notes that the development of decision tools for genetic diversity in animals potentially has some targeted research components. The application of such tools also has a potential wider application than the four Asian countries. For these reasons, STAP is interested in the development of the project, and its outcomes. It requests, therefore, that more detailed and precise methods and techniques are developed, including an analysis of the potential of existing decision support tools; define a baseline, how it will be tracked, and monitored; and, a more precise reasoning of incremental benefits. STAP would also like to note that an added barrier is limited understanding of methods that are suitable for valuing farm animal genetic resources (FAnGR). Refer to "Options and Strategies for the Conservation of Farm Animal Genetic Resources", Gibson, J. et al., 2005 - <http://books.google.com/books>

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. No objection</b>	STAP has no scientific/technical grounds to object to the approval of the concept. However, in Section IV, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission.
<b>2. No objection, but follow-up action required.</b>	STAP has no objection to the approval of the PIF, but has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities, stated in section IV, that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting an independent expert review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for this review The proponent should provide the report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.
<b>3. Objection</b>	STAP objects to the approval of the PIF on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical faults in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. In the case of the project concept nevertheless being approved by the CEO of the GEF for development of the full project brief, a STAP review should be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement.