

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: 8 October 2009

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley & Paul Ferraro

I. PIF Information

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEF PROJECT ID: 3856 **PROJECT DURATION:** 24 months

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:

COUNTRY(IES): Global (Up to 110 developing countries and countries with economies in transition)

PROJECT TITLE: UNEP-GEF Project for Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH II

GEF AGENCY: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): UNEP-DELC AND National Executing Agencies in countries

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM: BD-SP-6

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: BIOSAFETY PROGRAM

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

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency:
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP notes this extension to a previous project. The outcomes could be more clearly stated in the PIF, the project framework table sets out intermediate outcomes while actual outcomes begin to be described at page 7 (last paragraph of section C). Whilst it is understood that the project is focussed on intermediate outcomes, at least one outcome in section A is an output ("identify and train 10 new RAs").
3. The full project proposal could also clarify some issues of timing and continuity from BCH1 to BCH2. For example, Part A, Section 2, page 4: "[the current project] is intended to close by the end of 2008" – did it? Have there been interim arrangements?

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, 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 for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities 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 a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review 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.
3. Major revision required	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. 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.