

# 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: May 05, 2015

Screener: Virginia Gorsevski

Panel member validation by: Brian Child  
Consultant(s):

### I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 8025

**PROJECT DURATION :** 4

**COUNTRIES :** Peru

**PROJECT TITLE:** Effective Implementation of the Access and Benefit Sharing and Traditional Knowledge Regime in Peru in accordance with the Nagoya Protocol

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNEP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Env in collaboration with GIZ

**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):  
**Major issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the submission of this concept for a project that intends to promote access and benefit sharing (ABS) under the Nagoya Protocol.

The objective of this project is to: "Strengthen national capacities for effective implementation of the access to genetic resources (ABS) and traditional knowledge (TK) regimes in accordance with the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization, contributing to the conservation of biodiversity and human well being in the country."

The project seeks to establish (1) efficient functioning ABS mechanisms in accordance with the Nagoya Protocol (2) build capacity of various actor in relation to access to genetic resources and traditional knowledge and (3) pilot projects and initiatives on access and benefit sharing, contributing to the sustainable use of biological diversity.

While the Project Description appears logical, the PIF is difficult to evaluate because it contains a lot of unclear wording, especially in the section on components which needs to be clarified, strengthened, and carefully aligned with the Project Description. For example, what do the following statements actually mean and, more to the point, how will they be implemented?:

- "The creation of a technical unit as integrating space for access management and information deposited in the Clearinghouse mechanisms of CBD secretariat (ABS-CH), generation of information on strategic genetic resources, associated traditional knowledge, and ongoing research processes, that help design and implement a(n) strategy(s) for benefit sharing (monetary and non-monetary), and the National Mechanism for Integrated Monitoring and Supervision (MNSSI-ABS) established in the regulations, including verification points and measures for regularization of illegal access".
- "A judicial, institutional and administrative perspective assessment of function of the national ABS system is also part of this component"
- "Capacity building on access negotiation and benefit distribution will be focused on providers and users of four experiences on requests for authorization of access contracts, presented to relevant authorities. In the case of providers, specially farmers, as well as forest concessions and administrators of regional and private conservation areas"

Also needing clarification are the differences in the Project Description between outputs 1.b.1 and 1.b.4 (both talk about inventories), and 1.c.1 and 1.a.1 (working unit and operational unit). In addition to complex wording (and possible repetition) that makes it difficult to understand what this project is about, the PIF needs to clarify the scale and the scope of the project, and also to provide clear indicators in the Project Description to enable it to be evaluated effectively.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.  (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>