

# 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 25, 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:** 5283

**PROJECT DURATION :** 4

**COUNTRIES :** Regional (Angola, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Congo DR)

**PROJECT TITLE:** Multi-Country Project to Strengthen Institutional Capacity on LMO Testing in Support of National Decision-making

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNEP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Participating Laboratories: Angola, Congo Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Malawi, Madagascar, Namibia and Regional Agricultural and Environment Initiatives network-Africa (RAEIN-AFRICA)

**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 concept for a project intending to build and strengthen institutional capacities for GM detection in support of national decision making processes in biosafety regulatory systems in six countries of the Southern Africa region.

The proposal is well thought through and thus its presentation is clear, focused, and concise. The Objective is clearly stated and to the point and the project structure is logical and coherent. It is noted that Outcome indicators will need to be developed during the PPG.

The problem definition is concise and clear. The barriers are clearly defined and described. The linkages between the problem, the barriers and the proposed Outcomes and supporting Outputs are strongly evident. The baseline is described comprehensively and the provision of the Annexes further underscores this thorough treatment of the baseline. It is noted, however, that relevant baseline financial expenditures are not yet provided. The contribution of the project to securing GEBs is evident and the incremental cost reasoning is presented clearly and convincingly.

The project's innovation lies in the establishment of a network model for the provision of required technical support at the regional level. It is pointed out that national obligations will help to ensure the sustainability of the project's results. However, the level of obligations differs between countries, and so multiple context specific strategies may be necessary to achieve long-term success. The scaling-up potential is considerable but is only partially addressed at this stage. Some more details on this should be developed at the PPG stage.

The principal stakeholders are defined and their anticipated roles in the project are described. The importance of gender considerations in both the project's design and subsequent implementation is recognized and addressed through planned capacity building.

The principal risks are adequately defined, their levels are realistic and the proposed mitigation measures are appropriate. Climate change related risks, however, are not presented in the risk table - however the relevance of climate change related risks should receive further attention during the PPG. The relationship of this project to other relevant ones and coordination requirements are mentioned but the specific coordination

arrangements are to be determined at the PPG stage. STAP looks forward to seeing evidence of these arrangements

<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>