

# 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 09, 2017  
Screener: Sunday Leonard  
Panel member validation by: Ricardo Orlando Barra Rios  
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	9654
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Regional (Indonesia, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Malaysia, Philippines, Vietnam)
PROJECT TITLE:	Reducing Pollution and Preserving Environmental Flows in the East Asian Seas through the Implementation of Integrated River Basin Management in ASEAN Countries
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	PEMSEA Resource Facility; National Water Agencies in the 8 participating countries
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):  
**Minor issues to be considered during project design**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

This project aims to "to improve integrated water resources management, reduce pollution loads from nutrients and other land-based activities, sustain freshwater environmental flows and reduce climate vulnerability through demonstrations and replications, planning and strengthening of integrated river basin management in selected countries in the East Asian Seas". The project targets 8 East Asian countries including Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam. The targeted countries are at different stages of adoption of the IRBM and ICM. The project objective is planned to be achieved by implementing activities under 3 components including:

1. Baseline Assessment of Source to Sea Management Continuum
2. Governance for Improved IRBM
3. Knowledge Management and Learning

The project document have been well prepared and thought through and the project objective and expected outcome and outputs are consistent with the problem analysis. It includes a detail analysis of the problem, including gaps, the baseline situation and it outlines appropriate actions to address the gaps and the various challenges in a consistent manner.

The STAP thinks that the project would deliver the desired result if well implemented according proposed activities. We provide the following guidance to be considered during the full project design stage:

1. Component 1 on baseline assessment of source to sea management continuum: this component will focus on gathering and analysing information on bio-physical and land-based pollution. We assume that some scientific analysis (field- and laboratory-based) will be undertaken in this component. No information on the proposed or planned methodology has been provided at this stage. The STAP suggest that this

information should be provided during the full project development stage. This will be useful to gauging the scientific and technical suitability and credibility of chosen methodology.

2. Still in component 1, it was stated that some modelling activities for pollutant load and water use will be undertaken. It will also be useful to provide some information on the models that is planned to be used in implementing this activity. The STAP further advise that, if the resources are available, such modelling work should not rely on a single model but should be implemented using multiple modelling tools in order to help improve robustness and scientific credibility and reduce uncertainty of model results.

3. Component 3: No specific output was provided in Table B although the description of the component seems to be littered with potential products that can be termed as outputs. We advise that the expected outputs should be included during the development of the full project. Some possible outputs include:

- a. For Outcome 3.1 on common IRBM indicator: A documentation of the list of identified and agreed common indicator including guidance on how these indicators should be used as well as description of mechanisms or tasks and responsibilities for river basin management.
- b. For Outcome 3.2 focused on capacity building, training and capacity building initiatives could be considered as the outputs
- c. For Outcome 3.3 on knowledge and good practice transfer, the knowledge transfer initiative or efforts could be valid output. Along this line, does the project envisage developing a knowledge transfer products such as guidance, or reports that can be used to convey the lessons learnt? We think this will be a useful product that can help further in the replicability of the project.

<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>	<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.</p> <p>(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>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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>