

# 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: @@@@ @@, @@@@ Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz

Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT**    **GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4577

**PROJECT DURATION :** 3

**COUNTRIES :** Bolivia

**PROJECT TITLE:** Conservation and Sustainable Use of Agro-biodiversity to Improve Human Nutrition in Five Macro Eco-regions

**GEF AGENCIES:** FAO

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministry of Environment and Water (Viceministry of Environment, Biodiversity, Climate Change, and Forest Development); and Ministry of Rural Development and Land

**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 this proposal which builds on previous projects supported by FAO, IFAD, UNEP, IADB, among other organizations. The links with these previous efforts, the complementarity of this new project with respect to them, and the role of a number of participating Bolivian institutions are clearly explained.

The global environmental benefits (agrobiodiversity) and the local benefits (nutrition, food security and food sovereignty) to be gained are clearly stated. There is proper consideration of risks; climate change is incorporated in the project, which explicitly aims to assess the resilience to climate change of different species and varieties of traditional crops. The approach to community participation and gender inclusion is sound and solidly based on knowledge of local culture. The expected outputs are mostly clear and realistically achievable.

STAP would encourage the project proponents to take into consideration the following questions/issues when preparing the final proposal:

1. How is the resilience to climate change going to be assessed? What will be the role of the local communities in such assessment and how the issue of climate change vulnerability/resilience will be incorporated in the work with them?
2. One of the expected outcomes of the project is that 50% of the land of the communities will be devoted to agrobiodiversity-friendly cultivation. What is the percentage now, what is the management of the land which is not managed in that way at present and what would be the socio-economic consequences of the planned change?
3. How will the genetic/agrobiodiversity trends be monitored in the field once the project is implemented in order to assess whether the planned changes in land use will have a significant positive impact on crop agrobiodiversity?
4. Wild crop relatives are mentioned, although they are clearly not the main target of the proposed intervention. The project will benefit for a clearer explanation as to how these will be considered.
5. How will the market benefits be assessed, with respect to the current situation?
6. In general, the project will benefit from more explicit baseline information (e.g. what percentage of the land is managed in an agrobiodiversity-friendly way at present, what is the average family/community income, what is the nutritional value of the diet, what is the public awareness of the importance of traditional varieties). Also, this project appears highly amenable to an experimental or quasi-experimental design that would greatly improve the assessment of the impact of the project in terms of land use, genetic trends, income, etc. For example, situations that incorporate the agrobiodiversity-friendly design could be compared with situations that don't, but are otherwise very similar. In this respect, STAP encourages the project proponents to consult with STAP regarding proposed approaches for

incorporating experimental design methods into projects. A GEF Council advisory document will be released shortly.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> <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 revision required</b>	<p>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.</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>