

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: May 06, 2013

Screeners: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Jakob Granit
Consultant(s): Douglas Taylor

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4748

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Regional (Central African Republic, Cameroon, Niger, Nigeria, Chad)

PROJECT TITLE: Improving Lake Chad Management through Building Climate Change Resilience and Reducing Ecosystem Stress through Implementation of the SAP

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Lake Chad Basin Commission, UNESCO

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): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP has over recent years considered a number of GEF-supported projects connected to the Lake Chad Basin, most recently the Program proposed by the AfDB "Improving Lake Chad Management through Building Climate Change Resilience and Reducing Ecosystem Stress through Implementation of the SAP (GEF ID 4680). This and other baseline projects in the region together with the proposed project Improving Lake Chad Management Through Building Climate Change, Resilience and Reducing Ecosystem stress, focus on the implementation of the agreed TDA and SAP (endorsed in 2008). Multiple investments into further identifying the root causes of the current degradation of the socio-ecologic system and options for regional governance systems building future resilience will be necessary to ensure global, regional and national public goods.
2. STAP welcomes the intention of the proponents that the project presented in this PIF will collaborate closely with the AfDB Program. STAP's advice to the proponents for the Program focused on the perceived weakness of the LCBC, including lack of political support; therefore STAP welcomes the focus in Component 1 on the strengthening of the LCBC and its mandate. STAP welcomes that LCBC will be one of the two executing agencies so that they will get a clear role in project implementation further to be clarified in the full proposal. The full project design should include full descriptions of how the coordination between several regional investments should take place and discuss options for future sustainability (see also #6).
3. STAP was in earlier screens concerned about the under-researched need to examine trade-offs regarding surface and ground water budgets across the basin and is therefore satisfied that the current PIF outlines UNESCO/BGR actions to address this challenge.
4. STAP understands that the LCBC has already started to update the SAP. STAP supports the intention of the proposed project to strengthen that effort. This will address the unfinished business of the Strategic Action Program (SAP), and the lack of an Action Plan with which to roll out the SAP actions. STAP advises that any emerging SAP Action Plan needs to be scientifically peer reviewed.
5. For the five priority Ecosystem Quality and Water Resource (EQWRO) objectives arising from the SAP and the additional objectives taken from the NAPA and other convention-related instruments, STAP advises the proponents to carefully consider assumptions concerning the causal chain and therefore priorities assigned to the proposed pilot projects envisaged. This is important to enable interventions that can sensibly be conducted in parallel, such as reforestation, cookstove technology, improving power distribution, to proceed, but others such as increased use of irrigation, sustained fishing effort, review of existing dams, are interdependent and require a more structured approach.

6. STAP welcomes the fact that the project has a regional partner by virtue of the coordination role of the LCBC but the PIF is silent about how this relationship fits into the broader regional political economy. Accordingly STAP would welcome clarification in the full project brief. What would be the role of the African Union (if any) in the context of managing the complex Lake Chad region also considering other overlapping regional economic frameworks that the counties are part of?

7. Finally the risk table outlines key risks in structured and realistic manner. However it is relatively weak in proposing how the project would mitigate the risks that are noted. Amongst the most significant risk noted is political instability. Coordination amongst stakeholders will not mitigate this risk alone. A strong effort towards building trust for cooperation and resilience in the region needs to be built. This can be linked to broader political and economic activities beyond the mandate of the LCBC (see #6). Similarly the risks related to environmental variability, insecurity and inter-basin transfer are correctly noted but the mitigation strategies should be further developed in the full proposal. In particular the full proposal needs to address broader sustainability factors related to the governance framework and the role of tackling poverty and stimulating economic growth.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</p>
3. Major revision required	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up: (i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>