

# 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: May 04, 2015

Screeener: Virginia Gorsevski

Panel member validation by: Brian Child  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 9058

**PROJECT DURATION :** 5

**COUNTRIES :** Regional (Latin America and Caribbean)

**PROJECT TITLE:** Impact Investment in Support of the Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (non-grant)

**GEF AGENCIES:** IADB

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:**

**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):  
**Major issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP acknowledges the submission of this concept for a project that intends to promote access and benefit sharing (ABS) under the Nagoya Protocol. STAP looks forward to a much improved program framework over the coming months.

The objective of this project is to provide technical and financial assistance to Small and Medium Enterprises in Latin America and the Caribbean working in value chains aligned with the provisions of the Nagoya Protocol.

The Indicative Project Description has a single Component (supporting nature based SMMEs) and Outcome (SMME's adding value to nature based products) and four Outputs namely (1) market analysis linked to contracts with SMMEs (2) grants to study market initiatives (3) technical assistance for 10 SMMEs and (4) an SMME investment fund.

Nowhere in the PIF (including notably in the section on Global Environmental Benefits) is there any specificity or any indicators of BD impact, which species will be used and why, how this will affect global biodiversity priorities, nor statement on how the sustainability of the use of BD will be assured or monitored.

Much of the Baseline Scenario is dedicated to describing the EcoEnterprise Fund. However, in places this reads like a promotional website for EcoEnterprises, and provides no due diligence or evidence regarding claims of past successes. For example, at the bottom of p4 no evidence is provided regarding the claim that "the Fund has proven that small community-based companies in biodiversity-friendly sectors like organic agriculture, sustainable forestry, and ecotourism can be both financially viable and protect natural systems and the wealth of biodiversity for future generations".

STAP believes, primarily for the reasons stated above, this project requires major revisions in order to be viable.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple "Concur" response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued

	<p>rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.</p>
<p><b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.  (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>
<p><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</p> <p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>