

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: January 19, 2012

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams
Consultant(s): Thomas Hammond

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4533

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Global

PROJECT TITLE: Development of a Methodology With Tools and Decision Support Systems to Incorporate Floods and Droughts into IWRM in Transboundary Basins

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: UNEP-DHI Centre, DHI, IWA

GEF FOCAL AREA: International Waters

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

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies): **Major revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP is unable to endorse this PIF for reasons outlined below.

1. The PIF points out the importance of droughts and floods in IWRM, and consequently IW priorities but gives little specific indication of where these priorities have been expressed, such as published papers, conference proceedings, project reports, etc.

2. The plan of the project appears to be pushed by science and modelling while potential users not well identified. The PIF is very light on detail and written in generalities. The partners are all other international agencies or scientific and engineering agencies presently lacking any complementary GEF recipient country scientific and technical focal point representation.

3. This project is not written in such a way as to give a clear, effective description of what it intends to do and where. As such it is hard to assess, given that the baseline situation is inadequately presented in the PIF without any GEF recipient country, river basin or coastal zone examples to demonstrate needs against which the GEF incremental reasoning could be set.

4. STAP advises therefore that the project brief can and should make a much more convincing case for the proposed Decision Support System. The Panel suggests that this can be achieved through documented examples of needs identified and endorsed by suitable scientific and technical bodies and/or focal points drawn from GEF recipient countries. This information could then be used to demonstrate how global environmental benefits would flow from the proposed approach compared to a documented baseline.

<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:

	<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>
<p>3. Major revision required</p>	<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>