

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:	9912
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Regional (Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda)
PROJECT TITLE:	Enhancing Conjunctive Management of Surface and Groundwater Resources in Selected Transboundary Aquifers: Case Study for Selected Shared Groundwater Bodies in the Nile Basin
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	NBI, UNESCO, IAEA
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 appreciates the preparation of this comprehensive project to enhance understanding of groundwater and surface water interactions and conjunctive management in key pilot areas within the Nile Basin.
2. A key feature of the present proposal is the excellent collation of experience from many GEF and non-GEF projects when considering the design of proposed interventions. There are indeed many past and current projects focused upon sustainable groundwater management. One project which could usefully be included in the list of complementary actions is the World Bank project Sustainable Groundwater Knowledge and Governance in the Sahel (GEF ID 9886); this is about shared regional interests in role of river basin organizations in groundwater governance, and development and application of diagnostic tools to deliver sustainable groundwater management. An important and promising outcome, beyond the direct achievements in the region, is improved knowledge and methods (e.g. isotope hydrology technique) for use in other aquifers and sub-basins.
3. A minor point: The PIF asserts (in the root causes section) that this is the first project focusing on groundwater in the Nile Basin, yet STAP understands that the predecessor project, described in an Annex to the PIF, was in fact the first project, the findings of which would be assumed to form the basis for the design of the present proposal. Another one: in the superb detailed presentation of Project outcomes, etc., the specification of Outcome 1 on page 19 is missing.

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
------------------------	--

<p>1. Concur</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>(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.</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>
<p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>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:</p> <p>(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.</p> <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>