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I. PIF Information (Copied from the PIF)

FULL SIZE PROJECT      GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID: 5720
PROJECT DURATION: 4
COUNTRIES: Sri Lanka
PROJECT TITLE: Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework in Accordance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB)
GEF AGENCIES: FAO
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment and Renewable Energy
GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

II. STAP Advisory Response (see table below for explanation)

Based on this PIF screening, STAP’s advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the submission of this concept for a project intending to strengthen institutional, regulatory and technical capacities for the effective implementation of the National Biosafety Framework in compliance with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

Overall, the proposal is well structured and clearly and logically presented. The linkages between the problem, the barriers, and the proposed Outcomes and Outputs are evident, coherent and clearly presented. One item which perhaps deserves clarification or at least improved consistency pertains to the inclusion of the term policy in Outcome 1, but not in the Objective. This form of inconsistency is also noted in other parts of the text. For example, Barrier 1 is defined as inadequate legal and regulatory frameworks whereas Component 1 addresses the strengthening of relevant policy, institutional and regulatory frameworks. Outcome indicators will also require development during the PPG.

The general context and problem are defined clearly and the primary key barriers are well articulated. The baseline activities are rather extensive and are described thoroughly and baseline financial expenditures are explained. The alternative scenario and its components are well described and the incremental cost reasoning is clear. The GEBs are evident and succinctly described.

The proposed project possesses elements of innovation and innovation and sustainability of the project’s results are addressed through the project’s design. Scaling-up could receive more attention though.

The principal stakeholders are defined but for many of them, their roles have to be more specifically defined beyond "involved as project partners".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAP advisory response</th>
<th>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consent</td>
<td>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. **Minor revision required.** | STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.  
Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:  
(i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions.  
(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP’s recommended actions. |
| --- | --- |
| 3. **Major revision required** | STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.  
Follow-up:  
(i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP.  
(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns. |