

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility



STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: 01st October 2009

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: N.H. Ravindranath

I. PIF Information (*Paste here from the PIF*)

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 4114

COUNTRY: SRI LANKA

PROJECT TITLE: BAMBOO PROCESSING FOR SRI LANKA

GEF AGENCY: UNIDO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER: SRI LANKA CLEANER PRODUCTION CENTRE

GEF FOCAL AREA: CLIMATE CHANGE /TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM: CC-SP4- BIOMASS

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: TT-PILOT (GEF-4)

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(ies):
Consent

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP commends the comprehensive framework (TT chain and multiple uses of bamboo) proposed in the project aiming at establishing bamboo supply chain and processing in Sri Lanka. Project seems to benefit from South-south TT from India and China. At the CEO endorsement phase, STAP expects that project proponents provide specific details on how to assure and enforce sustainability of bamboo plantations and processing without adverse impacts on competitive agricultural land-use/food security and biodiversity conservation.

Empiric evidence is ambiguous on the impact of non-timber forest products on local livelihoods. A number of safeguards and monitoring mechanisms have to be employed to demonstrate positive effects of the proposed industrial bamboo processing on the income of the poor. At the project preparation phase, STAP recommends exploring specific mechanisms of how to engage local communities and assure continuous income transfer. Without these mechanisms, sustainability of project impacts will be compromised.

Selection of Bamboo alone for the plantation project needs more justification. Though we agree that bamboo is an important option, it is necessary to compare bamboo with short rotation woody plantations. Short rotation woody plantations can provide higher biomass productivity. The yield assumed (15 tonnes per/ha/yr) seems to be very high; a more realistic yield could be around 5 tonnes/ha/yr. Short rotation woody plantations are more hardy and suitable for different soil and rainfall conditions. Bamboo may not be suitable for cultivation under all soil and rainfall conditions. Thus, there is a need for serious consideration of other species also along with bamboo.

Utilization of bamboo pellets for local energy use may be a difficult proposition given the cost of pelleting process. Export of bamboo pellet may not be a feasible proposition given the cost of pelleting, storage, transport, handling etc.

Developing market for bamboo sprouts and pellets as food may be a challenging proposition given the cost involved.

The proposal talks about transfer of processing technology. There is a need for clarification on what processes and technologies will be transferred to Sri Lanka.

A more realistic assessment of the global environmental benefits is necessary since many of the GEBs listed are indirect and some of them may not be realized at all (e.g., EU demand for bamboo pellets). Will bamboo residue be used for cooking or for process heat or biomass power generation?

<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.	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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 <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 revision required	<p>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.</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>