

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: 5760

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Brazil

PROJECT TITLE: Capacity Building and Institutional Strengthening on the National Framework for Access and Benefit Sharing under the Nagoya Protocol

GEF AGENCIES: IADB

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environment

Ministry of Science and Technology

Supervisory Committee of the National Genetic Heritage Council

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):
Minor revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP notes the submission of this important and timely concept for a project intending to develop a national legal and regulatory framework and administrative procedures that enable access to genetic resources and benefit sharing in accordance with provisions of the CBD and Nagoya Protocol in a key biodiversity-rich country.

The overall project framework is well balanced and demonstrates strong coherence between the project Objective, its Components and the expected Outcomes and proposed Outputs. Regarding the Objective, perhaps an important element of Component 3 could be reflected in this statement. Improved awareness, capacities and negotiating skills of indigenous peoples and local communities, for instance, go beyond administrative procedures.

While the brevity of this concept paper is commendable, certain expected elements are either missing (perhaps because they were not considered necessary, or self-evident for a project of this nature) or are addressed very briefly. The overall problem is described by way of the historical context of the project. Root causes and barriers are not presented explicitly. The baseline receives cursory mention only towards the end of the proposal in the description of the project's consistency with relevant national strategies and other initiatives. There is, however, no mention of baseline investments. The incremental cost reasoning is not clearly laid out. The GEBs to be generated by the project are understood but could perhaps be elaborated further. While the project is clearly ground breaking in a variety of ways, there is no discussion of its innovative aspects as such. Moreover, issues likely to affect the sustainability of the project's results or its potential for scaling-up are addressed explicitly. While the principal identified stakeholders are presented by way of a comprehensive listing, there is no mention of their roles and value added in the project. However, the proposal does clearly recognize the importance of gender considerations and provides a strong rationale for this.

The primary risks, their level and mitigation measures are presented but the list of risks could be expanded further. While the need for close coordination with other relevant projects and programmes is recognized, no coordination mechanism or processes that may be employed are presented. In summary, while the need for

the project is clearly evident (as are expected benefits) and while the overall project framework is sound, the missing elements noted above require further attention and create challenges for adequate review and assessment at this stage.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<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>
2. Minor revision required.	<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>
3. Major revision required	<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>