

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: 14 February 2008

Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Stocking

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 2701

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: PIMS No. 3243

COUNTRY(IES): Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa

PROJECT TITLE: Development and adoption of a Strategic Action Program for balancing water uses and sustainable natural resource management in the Orange-Senqu River transboundary basin

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: UNOPS, Orange-Senqu River Commission (ORASECOM)

GEF FOCAL AREAS: International Waters

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): IW SP3: Balancing overuse and conflicting uses of water resources in transboundary surface and groundwater basins

Full size project GEF Trust Fund

II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
Minor revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. The project is welcomed as a comprehensive approach to a complex watershed. STAP screened the proposal when it was submitted originally as a PIF in September 2007 to the GEF Secretariat. STAP's screen stated the following -

"STAP has no objection to the proposal, but requests follow-up action by the proponent. These are:

1) What are the IWRM interventions that the project will implement? The PIF does not say what these will be, or how they will be administered.

2) Specify further the global environment benefits. The generation of global environment benefits is potentially large, but the PIF does not identify them comprehensively nor establish their potential. The climate change risk is also large, and could easily reverse the global environment benefits in this environment.

3) Component #2 is for the completion of the transboundary diagnostic analysis. Has this been done? If not, STAP believes that the PIF may be premature. If it is available, STAP requests a copy so it can better assess the proposed interventions and respond to the proponent with suggestions that may improve the project design."

STAP's principal concern remains the uncompleted TDA, the work for which is built into the project as Component 2. The proposal states that the project will use IWRM principles, demonstrating the application of integrated land and water resource management practices in the upper catchment of the basin. It will also promote the harmonization of policies and activities necessary to effectively address transboundary water concerns in the basin. STAP's concern is that the TDA may well identify alternative important issues that are outside the scope of GEF's interests and the intention of the present project. Regarding Component #2 in point 3. STAP acknowledges that the TDA's completion may well answer some of the outstanding questions regarding IWRM interventions and associated indicators. but then the proposed interventions might need to be re-targeted. It was also not clear what remained to be done to complete the TDA. However, STAP recommends that UNDP addresses these comments to strengthen the proposal during its development following CEO approval. STAP suggests building into Component 2, specific mention of analysis for ecosystem functions and dangers to IWRM. In support of this action,

STAP suggests that UNDP opens a dialogue with STAP to clarify the issues raised above, and for UNDP to provide a report of the action agreed and taken when UNDP submits the full project brief for CEO endorsement.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review <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>
3. Major revision required	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement.</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>