

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: February 21, 2014

Screener: Paul Grigoriev

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz

Consultant(s): Thomas Hammond

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5533

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : China

PROJECT TITLE: Developing and Implementing the National Framework on Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Environmental Protection

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

2. STAP welcomes the submission of this clearly well thought through concept for a project to develop and implement China's national framework on access to and benefit sharing (ABS) of genetic resources and associated traditional knowledge in accordance with the CBD Nagoya Protocol.

The proposal is concise and well-focused, demonstrates strong coherence among the elements of its framework, and is well presented. The use of summary tables is appreciated.

The objective is clear and related to the achievement of GEBs. The problem is defined clearly and concisely. The relationship between the primary barriers, which are clearly defined and elaborated upon, and planned outputs and outcomes is clear. Indicators at the outcome level will need to be developed during the PPG.

With one exception, the proposed developments are plant-based. Perhaps the title and main aims of the project could be slightly re-oriented to reflect this? A sharper focus on plants might actually be an advantage, considering the number of extra issues to be considered in traditional medicine practices involving animals.

The baseline is comprehensive and is presented in detail. The potential pilots are well defined and summarized, and present a good "package" that represents a diversity of demonstration benefits at all appropriate levels.

The incremental cost reasoning is solid and the anticipated GEBs are clear and well presented.

The innovation, sustainability and replication aspects of the project are treated in a rather cursory manner but they are clear and evident. The scaling-up potential is huge. As noted in the proposal, the replication strategy and plan will be produced.

The definition of stakeholders and their roles is comprehensive and clear. However, it is noted that gender differentiation has not been considered and will be required during the PPG, particularly for Component 3 pilots.

Risks are well presented and the mitigation or "preventive" measures are realistic and well defined. Climate change risk, however, is not mentioned. Neither is a risk associated with effective engagement of local populations, such as producers.

Coordination measures are defined in a preliminary manner and further details concerning planned mechanism(s) and processes should be forthcoming during the PPG phase.

<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>