

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: October 2, 2008

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams

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

Full size project GEF Trust Fund

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 2706

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 3524 (UNDP)

COUNTRY(IES): CAPE VERDE, COMOROS, MALDIVES, MAURITIUS, SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE, SEYCHELLES

PROJECT TITLE: IMPLEMENTING INTEGRATED WATER RESOURCE AND WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT IN ATLANTIC AND INDIAN OCEAN SIDS

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNEP, UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): UNOPs, JOINT SECRETARIAT FOR THE CONVENTIONS FOR THE COOPERATION IN THE PROTECTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MARINE AND COASTAL ENVIRONMENT OF THE WESTERN AFRICAN REGION (ABIDJAN CONVENTION) AND THE EASTERN AFRICAN REGION (NAIROBI CONVENTION), INTERNATIONAL KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT – IKM/EcoAFRICA

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): International Waters

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): IW SP3: BALANCING OVERUSE AND CONFLICTING USES OF WATER RESOURCES IN TRANSBOUNDARY SURFACE AND GROUNDWATER BASINS

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:N/A

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

2. STAP acknowledges the scientific validity of the proposed integrated approach to water resource management and water use efficiency in the six African SIDS (inter-sectoral policy, legislative and institutional reform, capacity building, demonstration projects, and knowledge dissemination). STAP particularly notes the merit of incorporating Components C2 and C4 in the project design dealing with IWRM and water use efficiency monitoring and indicators framework and knowledge management, respectively. These components help to assure scientifically justified monitoring of the project's interventions and exchanges of best practices and lessons among participating countries and other SIDS in the Pacific and Caribbean facing similar environmental challenges. Indeed, this project may need to carefully focus and manage its networking given the plethora of other relevant SIDS projects.
3. At the PPG phase, STAP notes that the development of targeted demonstrations will take into account specific political, institutional, economic, and environmental conditions of the selected SIDS. Given limited resources, the selected demo projects should be priority investments with high replication potential and, to the degree possible, be climate-resilient interventions. Improper disposal of solid waste and eutrophication were considered to be the most severe concern in the Indian Ocean SIDS (GIWA Regional Assessment 45b, 2004). The GIWA report recommends a set of possible policy options for solid waste management. STAP proposes that this GEF project incorporates pilot demonstration(s) dealing with solid waste management in the context of IWRM (Component C1) and consider the impacts of this pollution source in Components C2 through C4.
4. With respect to the gender mainstreaming aspects of the project, STAP encourages inclusion of suitable gender experts. At present, the Gender and Water Alliance is mooted as a partner but does not yet seem a certainty.

<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>