

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: 11 February 2010

Screener: Guadalupe Duron and David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: N.H. Ravindranath

I. PIF Information

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4073 **PROJECT DURATION: 48 months**

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 4227

COUNTRY: Burkina-Faso

PROJECT TITLE: Promotion of Jatropha Curcas as a resource of Bioenergy in Burkina-Faso

GEF AGENCY: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of environment, SP/CONEDD (Permanent secretary of National council on environment and sustainable development)

GEF FOCAL AREA: Climate Change

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM: CC-SP4 Energy from Biomass

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: GEF Energy programme for West Africa

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency:
Minor revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP welcomes the proposed approach of this Jatropha biofuel project in Burkina-Faso, which aims to consider agronomic, economic, policy and sustainability aspects of Jatropha production. The project aims include the following:
 - a. Developing a legal framework
 - b. Develop a coordinated national policy
 - c. Identifying crop varieties for different soil and water conditions and assess yields
 - d. Developing good cultivation practices
 - e. Identifying land for agro-fuel production
 - f. Creating awareness and build capacity.
3. There is uncertainty and controversy associated with biofuel production and implications for food production, net GHG benefit, competition for water, impacts on biodiversity, etc¹. The Panel calls for a minor revision to ensure the full project document addresses the following issues:
 - a. Land use policy is necessary at national and regional levels based on assessment of competitive needs for land for food production, livestock grazing, biodiversity conservation, etc. Very often forest or agriculture land may get converted and the proposal should elaborate on how this risk (mentioned in Part G of the PIF) will be addressed.
 - b. Sustainable Jatropha production: Commercial viability of Jatropha cultivation depends on oil seed yield. Although Jatropha is supposed to be grown on marginal lands, in many countries the yield has not met expectations and farmers have been growing Jatropha in better crop land, using fertilizer, irrigation and pesticides. Thus there is a need for developing realistic estimates of Jatropha yield under minimal inputs or low energy input agriculture.
 - c. GHG implications form land conversion: The recent studies show that GHG benefits are minimal or could be negative, if cultivation of Jatropha involves land conversion, especially of forest land or grassland. The CO₂ emissions resulting from land conversion could lead to Carbon debt. Thus it is necessary to ensure that biofuel crop is grown on marginal or degraded or abandoned land.
 - d. Long term research on Jatropha: Research on agronomic or plant breeding could take several years to provide practically useful results. Breeding for drought or pest resistance could take 10

¹ See also "Assessing Biofuels": http://www.unep.fr/scp/rpanel/pdf/Assessing_Biofuels_Full_Report.pdf.

years or more. Will the project make arrangements to continue the research even beyond the project period?

- e. Barriers: The PIF states that political, technical and institutional barriers will be removed. There is a need for systematic approach to firstly identify the barriers and rank them.
- f. Biodiversity impacts: The full project document should include an appropriate invasive species risk assessment for the species if it is to be introduced into new areas.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review 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.
3. Major revision required	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. 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.