

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

Screeener: 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: 5688

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Global

PROJECT TITLE: UNEP-GEF Project for Sustainable Capacity Building for Effective Participation in the Biosafety Clearing House (BCH)

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: UNEP-DELC and National Executing Agencies

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 concept for an important, ambitious and challenging project that is intended to support eligible parties sustain and build capacity for effective participation in the Biosafety Clearing House in line with past COP/MOP Decisions, specifically BS VI/5 para 2f. This global project is a follow up to previous UNEP/GEF BCH-I and Continued Enhancement of Building Capacity for Effective Participation in the BCH (BCH-II) projects. It also responds to specific requests made at the COP/MOP-6 that GEF provide additional support for all parties for capacity building in the use of the BCH based upon experiences and lessons learned from the BCH-II Global project. The proposal also responds to recommendations from the terminal evaluation of the BCH-II project.

This concept builds upon the BCH-I and BCH-II projects, the lessons learned though their implementation, the recommendations arising from their evaluation and thereby addresses identified deficiencies and gaps. The structure of the proposed project is consequently sound and responsive to the identified requirements for continuing capacity building in this important area.

Given the background to this project, the context and problem is well described and the baseline is thoroughly documented.

STAP wishes to address, however, the identified barriers on page 9. Three barriers are identified: 1) Effective participation to the BCH; 2) National systems to gather, manage and upload information onto the BCH; and, 3) Coordination and sharing of experiences through the BCH. While a relatively minor issue, the barriers could more accurately be reflected as ineffective participation, poorly functioning systems and lack of coordination and sharing respectively. More importantly, what is presented under each of these barriers is more of a description of the issues rather than the actual barrier that must be overcome. What is not addressed is, for instance, what inhibits effective participation? The project description does address some of these concerns but the description of the barriers could be sharpened.

The alternative scenario builds upon the past efforts and the baseline and is clearly presented. The GEBs are inherent but not clearly specified. What is presented under GEBs is enhanced coordination, improved exchange of experiences, expertise and information, and harmonization of initiatives at national and regional

level. Therefore, these appear to be results and outcomes instead of GEBs. The link between results and GEBs should be made more explicit, along with the definition of GEBs.

Factors enhancing the sustainability of the project's expected results and the innovativeness of some of its elements, such as virtual learning support systems, are well presented. It is mentioned that further sustainability considerations will be addressed during the PPG stage, Being global, the project clearly possesses high scaling-up potential, perhaps starting with all of Africa.

The stakeholders and their roles in the project are well defined. It is noted in particular the degree to which the project wishes to be inclusive in this manner – from subsistence farmers to urban dwellers. The project will attempt to include all stakeholders' needs at the design stage and will be less top-down than earlier projects. It is both encouraging and refreshing to see the recognition that the widest possible range of social actors must be involved in a meaningful manner and that processes should be inclusive from the design stage onwards. Gender equality is mentioned insofar as it can be integrated into this project, namely through training opportunities offered at the national and regional levels.

The risks and proposed mitigation measures are identified and described well, although levels of risk are not defined. The Annex outlining the risks and mitigation measures is informative. Climate change related risks are not included in the project at this stage, which should be reconsidered during the PPG insofar as including such considerations in the capacity building processes.

A project of this nature and scope will certainly present its challenges from a coordination perspective. While existing mechanisms at the national level and past experiences will undoubtedly be important and be relied upon, the PPG stage will offer an opportunity to further clarify the mechanism(s) to be employed.

<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>