

# 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:** 5731

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Global

**PROJECT TITLE:** Strengthening Human Resources, Legal Frameworks and Institutional Capacities to Implement the Nagoya Protocol

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** National Competent Authorities, ABS focal points

**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 important and well-presented concept for a project intending to assist 25 yet to be determined countries in developing and strengthening their national ABS frameworks, human capacities and administrative capabilities in implementing the Nagoya Protocol.

Regarding the project framework, the Objective is clearly stated and is consistent with the problem. The problem is succinctly defined. A question is raised, however, concerning the lack of trust between users and providers of genetic resources mentioned as compounding the problem and as a barrier. While indeed the lack of trust is or may be a problem, the barrier may in fact lie deeper than just lack of trust since ILC's attitudes and deeply held beliefs and values will be touched upon. Lack of trust may be a manifestation of a deeper barrier. Paragraph 14 on page 7 touches upon this but it will remain to be seen whether increasing awareness will be a successful "prescription" to what is defined as a lack of trust that may in fact be seated deeper than the effort of raising awareness may overcome. The Components, Outcomes and Outputs likewise demonstrate strong coherence and links among themselves and the Objective. It is understood that baselines will be determined upon the selection of the participant countries in the project. The GEBs are clear but their presentation could be more precise or specific. As a side note, the use of the term "unleash" benefits, and this term appears several times, is perhaps somewhat presumptuous and overly optimistic. The innovation and sustainability aspects of the project are presented only in summary but adequately as is its scaling-up potential, which is very high. The list of primary stakeholders is understandably generic by nature at this point and will be refined as the project proposal develops further. Anticipated roles of the identified key stakeholders are defined but aside from one sentence in par. 14 concerning the recognized importance of women in community protocol development and use, no mention is made of additional gender considerations. It is assumed that this will be further developed and refined once the project countries are selected.

The risk definition and assessment is appropriate for this stage of project development but the proposed mitigation strategy for risk 2 (turnover at Ministerial level and change in priorities) seems rather far-fetched since it is not a strategy but hoping for the best in terms of continuity at the Ministerial level. While coordination will be of utmost importance given the global nature of this project with the participation of 25 countries, this issue is not well addressed in the proposal. Finally, mechanisms and processes which will be employed will undoubtedly be stated and described more explicitly in the final project document, and STAP looks forward to seeing these components at that stage.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>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.</p>