Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility
(Version 5)

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

Date of screening: April 14, 2014 Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz
Consultant(s): Paul Grigoriev

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*
FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID: 5738
PROJECT DURATION : 3
COUNTRIES : Mexico
PROJECT TITLE: Strengthening of National Capacities for the Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:
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 national institutional capacities and the legal and regulatory framework for implementing the Nagoya Protocol.

The proposal is generally well structured and presented. The numbering of paragraphs sequentially as opposed to by section would be preferable. The Objective is clear and consistent with the title and structure â€“ although care could be taken to structure this in a more concise manner. The Components support the Objective and the expected Outcomes and the proposed Outputs are logically linked. The Outcome indicators, of course, will require additional thought and clarification during the PPG stage. For Outcome 1, STAP would propose that the indicator address change in capacity using the scorecard. In addition, a rationale for 30% as a target would be useful. In addition, what is presented as Outcome 3.3 really is not an outcome but rather a target for an indicator that remains to be defined.

The project is described well although aspects of its presentation could be improved. Under heading 1 - Global environmental problems, root causes and barriers â€“ there is no little discussion on the latter two but what is offered is more of a description of the context and elements of the overall problem (which is in itself useful to the reader). While this information is presented later in the narrative, a more coherent structure would be useful.

Under the Threats section, the first three paragraphs present generic issues which are not project specific.

The use of the barrier table is effective. However, the explanation of the first barrier is somewhat unclear due to the use of an excessively long sentence.

The baseline description presents a good summary of varied personnel costs and other related contributions to GR work but does not outline the baseline scenario regarding the delivery of global environmental benefits. This area can be strengthened. Only one project is mentioned under the baseline, the GIZ supported Biodiversity Governance Project. Given the partners involved, it is surprising that there are no other baseline projects or activities which can be noted here.

The incremental cost reasoning is well presented. The GEBs are inferred since their description is rather weak and ill defined - more specific details are desirable.

Similarly, more details would be welcome concerning the sustainability of project results and its scale-up potential. These are all issues that should receive further attention during the PPG.

STAP wishes to suggest that the list of stakeholders be expanded to include indigenous people and local communities. Likewise, the list currently presents the mandates of the stakeholders rather than their anticipated roles and contributions to the project. In terms of coordination, related initiatives are mentioned but little is presented regarding this important area â€“ which will likely be a key component to success.

The definition of current primary risks and their appraisal is adequate, although it is strongly suggested that risks associated with the anticipated future effects of climate change in Mexico should be addressed explicitly and planned for in the course of further development of the project. Moreover, currently proposed mitigation measures should be revisited and will likely require further development during the PPG stage.

STAP advisory response	*Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed*
1. Consent	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. 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.
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.