

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: November 07, 2017
Screener: Sarah Lebel
Panel member validation by: Brian Child
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9481
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Uganda
PROJECT TITLE:	Institutional Capacity Strengthening for Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing in Uganda
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	National Environment Management Authority; Uganda National Council for Science and Technology
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 issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the UNEP proposal "Institutional Capacity Strengthening for Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing in Uganda". The project's stated objective is to "strengthen institutional capacity for effective implementation of the Nagoya Protocol and to conduct an effective awareness campaign on ABS in Uganda". STAP believes the PIF scientifically and technically is not always well developed, and that the logic is difficult to follow in the main text (though better presented in the summary table). Below are some recommendations to help strengthen the project and ensure its sustainability.

1. While STAP is highly supportive of ABS, and welcomes this approach in Uganda, the document leaves it quite unclear what these benefits might be. While in some sections of the text there appears to be a focus on a limited number of plant species with specific medicinal properties, and the mention of linkages with EU markets, several questions remain. Is the project targeting genetic resources, and if so which ones and what is their market potential? Or is it also targeting benefit sharing in the forestry and wildlife sectors? If this is so, what are the problems that need to be addressed because, at least in the wildlife sector, Uganda is considered to be quite forward thinking with park revenue sharing.
2. STAP is concerned with the complexity of the organizational environment that this project is addressing, without ever stating a theory of change, apart from bringing Uganda into line bureaucratically with Nagoya protocol requirements. The lack of clarity and purpose is reflected in the fact that this project has 28 outputs and a limited budget. Further, under Component 2, the project expresses the need to build the capacity of no less than 14 different organization, two of which are district councils and local communities. STAP is of the strong opinion that this is not possible.
3. The components proposed are necessary, and logical, but the underlying concern is that the economics are missing; what is the scale and the scope of benefits from ABS, and why therefore is this project important? STAP agrees the need for (1) a national framework (2) capacity-building and especially (3) local

government and community. However, STAP is concerned that the project is too unfocused, with too many moving parts, especially in Component 2, which risks consuming a lot of resources in trying to sort out complex bureaucracy. STAP therefore suggests that a bottom-up approach is used to 'coordinate' this complexity. The key aim becomes to strengthen pilot indigenous and local groups to benefit from their ABS resources, and the project then adaptively addresses the constraints to making this happen on the ground. This will ground the project in a real problem, and is likely to lead to much greater returns on the GEF investment. Please refer to the South Africa Grasslands Project for such an approach.

4. STAP welcomes the strong ambition of the project to raise awareness about Access and Benefits Sharing as a component of knowledge management. Moreover, introducing a more formal knowledge management strategy/system for the project would be useful in ensuring that unique tacit knowledge is well codified, but also that the lessons learned from this initiative are well recorded, accessible, and can be used to enhance replicability in the region. For these reasons, STAP would encourage the project developers to consult STAP's ongoing advice to the GEF at <http://www.stapgef.org/knowledge-management-gef> as well as some of the knowledge management tools that are currently recommended – see, for example <http://www.knowledge-management-tools.net/knowledge-management-systems.html>

5. It may be relevant to consider the risks associated with the failure of some of the project components, such as the unintended overexploitation of the genetic resources which this project is meant to protect following increased awareness of their economic value, and what mitigation measures should be put in place.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	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 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.
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	<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.</p> <p>(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>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<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>