

# 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: October 30, 2017  
Screener: Douglas Taylor  
Panel member validation by: Ferenc Toth  
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9594
PROJECT DURATION:	3
COUNTRIES:	Regional (Mauritania, Senegal)
PROJECT TITLE:	Strengthening Trans-boundary Cooperation for Improved Ecosystem Management and Restoration in the Senegal delta (Mauritania and Senegal)
GEF AGENCIES:	IUCN
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministries of Environment and Sustainable Development on Mauritania and Senegal
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):  
**Concur**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP welcomes this well-researched project which, at the downstream end of the Senegal River, consolidates the Senegal River basin-wide transboundary work that resulted in completion of a GEF-supported TDA/SAP by the OMVS. That foundation project significantly informs the baseline and proposals made in the present PIF.
2. The management of the fresh water resources within the proposed project area is largely dependent upon the upstream regime under the jurisdiction of the OMVS; therefore the proponents are to be commended for having reached agreement with OMVS to coordinate their interests within the project. In addition, the proposal recognizes that the Observatoire de l'Environnement de l'OMVS will be an essential partner to the Observatory of the Senegal Delta Trans-boundary Biosphere Reserve.
3. STAP recommends additional attention to the following aspects of the project design during its further development.
4. The PIF recognizes that one of the main constraints affecting the management of the Biosphere Reserve is competition for land between farmers and livestock owners, and acknowledges that this is not an easy conflict to manage. It will be important see some indication of how this conflict could be managed, and what kind of alternative livelihoods could be conceived of for the affected communities to reduce the external pressure on the Biosphere reserve. The challenge is similar, albeit of somewhat different nature, in fish stocks and fishing. Another issue is excessive illegal exploitation of natural resources. What are the root causes and how would legislation mitigate them?
5. Both the management and technical master plan work say that climate change will be considered (e.g. in component 1). However, the challenges due to climate change and insufficient adaptation are

nevertheless substantive risks that should be stated in the risks table, relevant to management of the marine/saline and freshwater dependent components of the Reserve. Additionally, the proponents are advised to evaluate the emerging results of the World Bank/GEF project (GEF ID 5133) Senegal River Basin Climate Change Resilience Development Project, and more generally its IDA counterpart, the Senegal River Basin Multi-Purpose Water Resources Development Project (WB ID P131323).

6. The OMVS facilitation of water flows and their seasonality and the reconciliation of the needs of wider Senegal River basin users and the Reserve need to be elaborated further. It is clear that the project itself will explore closer integration and use of observatory data across the Senegal basin with regard to the needs of the Reserve, however, the risk table should also reflect these challenges explicitly, and state whether the proponents consider mitigating these risks to be within the control of the project itself.

7. Regarding ecosystem management, IUCN's earlier review (Hamerlynck, O. and Duvail, S., 2003) of the Mauritanian part of the Senegal River delta highlights the relatively precise regime of water flow, quality and seasonality necessary to maintain sustainably the ecosystem services derived from the key wetland habitats of the Reserve. The present project appears to implicitly accept that trade-offs will be necessary, which underlines the need to define clear minimum standards of service and accountability across the many agencies involved at local, national and regional level. To this end, the description for Output 1.1.2 Management Plan for the SDTBR needs to be more precise regarding what criteria the proponents will use to measure the effectiveness of the Plan: especially in terms of the claimed global environmental benefits, including 'stop the degradation of ecosystems, habitats and natural resources, and to invest in sustainable management, restoration, protection and maintenance of the ecosystem services in this environment'. Preparation of the comprehensive Management Plan involves complex scientific issues. Any action in one part of the system may trigger a range of direct and indirect impacts in several other components. These linkages are imperfectly understood and need to be thoroughly assessed.

8. More generally, the project component descriptions and output table contain very few suggested outcome indicators regarding measurable results leading to the proposed outcomes. STAP looks forward to seeing specific targets defined in the full project brief.

Reference: Hamerlynck, O. and Duvail, S. (2003). The rehabilitation of the Delta of the Senegal River in Mauritania. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. viii + 88 pp

<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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.</li> <li>(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.</li> </ul> <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>
<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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</li> <li>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</li> </ul>

	<p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP's concerns.</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>
--	---