

# 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: November 06, 2017  
Screener: Douglas Taylor  
Panel member validation by: Christopher Whaley  
Consultant(s): Blake Ratner

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

<b>FULL-SIZED PROJECT</b>	<b>GEF TRUST FUND</b>
<b>GEF PROJECT ID:</b>	9566
<b>PROJECT DURATION:</b>	4
<b>COUNTRIES:</b>	Regional (Colombia, Ecuador)
<b>PROJECT TITLE:</b>	Integrated Management of Water Resources of the Mira-Mataje and Carchi-Guaitara, Colombia–Ecuador Binational Basins
<b>GEF AGENCIES:</b>	UNDP
<b>OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:</b>	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Colombia (MADS) and National Water Secretariat of Ecuador (SENAGUA)
<b>GEF FOCAL AREA:</b>	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):  
**Concur**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP supports this proposed project which is generally well-justified and should indeed advance regional development and economic integration. References to sources of information informing the baseline would, however, have greatly strengthened the proposal. In general the approach outlined conforms to the GEF TDA/SAP toolkit and will complement the many small-scale ongoing projects and initiatives underway in the target basins, especially the proposals for binational basin commissions. There are a number of improvements to project design that STAP recommends be considered at CEO endorsement stage as discussed below.

2. While acknowledging that the TDA/SAP process provides a well-understood path towards stress reduction and environmental stabilization, the project would benefit from an explicit theory of change. Key elements of the theory of change are left implicit, including the links between knowledge generation, capacity building, strategic planning, transboundary cooperation and policy, legal and institutional reforms. An explicit theory of change would help to frame the suggested actions and clarify the relationship between the components, especially their timing and interdependence, towards expected impact. Explicit articulation of underlying assumptions is also important including, critically, influence on private sector investment trends.

3. STAP appreciates that the project will be coordinated with several others within the region, especially the GEF/UNDP project Integrated Water Resources Management in the Puyango-Tumbes, Catamayo-Chira and Zarumilla Transboundary Aquifers and River Basins (GEF ID 5284), which involves Ecuador. That project has a well-developed causal chain analysis and includes benefit-sharing measures and attention to source-to-sea dynamics, both of which would be useful to include explicitly as opportunities within the present proposal. Regarding source-to-sea best practice, please consider the advice provided by STAP to

the GEF at: <http://www.stapgef.org/conceptual-framework-governing-and-managing-key-flows-source-sea-continuum>.

4. In addition, both countries (with other neighbors) are currently partners in the implementation of the Amazon Basin SAP (GEF ID 9770). Accordingly, at least at national level, it would be expected that relevant experience and capacity is already available as a baseline for further building on this project. However, no mention is made in the PIF of this foundational support, which STAP suggests reduces the barriers regarding governance and experience of IWRM.

5. Four pilot interventions are proposed; however, little information is provided about the strategy guiding these interventions. What are the pilots likely to attempt and when, and what strategy is in place for their selection? The information provided in the Component 4 narrative gives no indication of the likely stakeholder ownership (the text just mentions stakeholders vaguely) or sequencing of these pilots within the overall TDA/SAP development process. The mention of 'innovative technologies' and application to IWRM needs significant clarification.

6. Knowledge management (KM) practice is well developed within the GEF IW focal area and thus it is surprising that the relevant KM section of the PIF has been entirely omitted. The Component 4 narrative does focus on KM as its central thesis, and a commitment is made to deliver knowledge to IW:LEARN. However, STAP strongly suggests that experience from the IW:LEARN community should be drawn on early and referenced for further project design, alongside the specific project coordination intentions referred to earlier. In addition, the four pilot interventions proposed could usefully be peer reviewed before implementation through the IW:LEARN community.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple “Concur” response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:  (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to 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.
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:  (i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.  The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.  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.