

# 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: 18 September 2009

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley

### I. PIF Information

**Full size project**            **GEF Trust Fund**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 3808

**PROJECT DURATION:** 5 YEARS

**COUNTRIES:** Brazil, Kenya, Turkey, Sri Lanka

**PROJECT TITLE:** Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use for improved human nutrition and wellbeing

**GEF AGENCIES:** UNEP, FAO

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Ministerio do Meio Ambiente, Secretaria de Biodiversidade e Florestas (Brazil), Kenya Agricultural Research Institute, National Museums of Kenya, National Environment Management Authority of Kenya, General Directorate of Agricultural Research (Turkey), Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources/Department of Agriculture (Sri Lanka), Bioversity International, Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nations

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Biodiversity

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:** BD-SP4-Policy; BD-SP5-Markets

### 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 Agencies:  
**Minor revision required**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP notes this ambitious proposal to mainstream the conservation of agricultural biodiversity throughout its chain of development from wild relatives in nature to farm ecosystems and end uses in food consumption. However, the panel has concerns about whether and how the proposed interventions can work and calls for a minor revision.
3. The PIF focuses mainly on conservation of agricultural biodiversity in farm ecosystems but suggests biodiversity benefits in adjacent non-farmed ecosystems that will result through greater awareness of the health and nutrition benefits of biodiversity. The proposal is vague and repetitive without really clarifying what it means by "mainstreaming of agricultural biodiversity conservation into health and nutrition strategies". The theory of change appears to be that the health and nutrition sector has previously been disengaged from national decision making on environmental and agricultural policy in the four recipient countries. The full proposal should elaborate on this, describe whether the project will innovate in this regard or draw on lessons learnt in other parts of the world and assess whether the intervention is warranted and likely to succeed. For example:
  - a. Are there cases of the health and nutrition sector being influential advocates in land use policy, particularly in decisions involving competing demands to use land for conservation and sustainable use or for conversion to other uses?
  - b. Are there cases of under-utilised crops, in the realm of 'traditional knowledge' which, when captured, resolved health and nutrition in poor communities?
4. There is no good argument in the PIF as to why a four country approach would be better than individual, well focused, and well designed, projects. The overheads of such an approach will be huge, and the complexities of successfully managing a set of projects in four countries, especially of the nebulous nature of the project described, are beyond easy resolution. The full project proposal should consider whether a four country approach is preferable to four individual projects.

| <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"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> <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>  |