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

Date of screening: October 7, 2008
Screener: Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary
Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams

I. PIF Information

Full size project GEFFSEC Project ID: 3810
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:
COUNTRY(IES): Jordan, Israel, Palestinian Authority
PROJECT TITLE: Red Sea-Dead Sea Water Conveyance Study Program
GEF AGENCY(IES): World Bank
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):
GEF FOCAL AREA(S): International Waters,
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: RED

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):
The Science Panel's response is reserved until a fuller concept proposal is available

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP is not able to offer a formal advisory response on this PIF due to the minimal detail given. STAP also notes that no details of funding by GEF Focal Area are yet available and co-financing information is still to be determined.

3. However, the proposed Study to assess the feasibility of the Red Sea-Dead Sea Water Conveyance is welcomed provided that the scientific and technical work that will be performed under the Study is objectively driven, open and transparent regarding the status of the Dead Sea and that all options and alternatives for its management and recovery remain open for review during the period of the Study. Proposed water transfers at any scale require full environmental, including biodiversity, and social assessment from a regional perspective and STAP notes that the Terms of Reference for the Study do apparently provide for comprehensive coverage of major issues.

4. Adaptive management of the Study to enable additional and unforeseen risks to be assessed including hydrological, climatic, ecological and social, should be explicitly enabled, the present Study ToR does not deal with this issue.

5. As the Terms of Reference of the Feasibility Project indicate, the project is viewed differently by different stakeholders, especially either as a water project with environmental benefits or as an environmental project with water supply benefits. Taking an environmental approach, STAP recommends that the Terms of Reference pay more attention to the unique biodiversity of both seas, especially that of the Dead Sea, and the likely impacts on any option on biodiversity. STAP notes, however, that a 'business as usual' scenario would likely lead to extinction of the Dead Sea biodiversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAP advisory response</th>
<th>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consent</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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. |