

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: 11 March 2008

Screener: Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3519

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 4055

COUNTRY(IES): Argentina, Uruguay

PROJECT TITLE: Reducing and preventing land-based pollution in the Rio de la Plata/Maritime Front through implementation of the FrePlata Strategic Action Programme

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): CARP and CTMFM in coordination with other agencies involved with the SAP

GEF FOCAL AREA (S): International Waters

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): IW SP-2

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): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP strongly supports the thrusts of this project. It is well founded on the TDA and clearly needed since the bilateral and cross-sectoral dimensions for implementing the SAP and NAPs are not assured without further support.
3. In developing the project, research may be needed to better understand which sources make the greatest contributions to the pollution detected in the environment. This would be in addition to the source and hotspot monitoring. Experience in other large estuaries shows that once point source pollution is more strongly controlled, the large and more difficult to control non-point sources (agriculture, urban run-off, atmospheric) are revealed. In addition, more upstream monitoring of all sources may be required to ensure that at-source measures are more effectively targeted. The current TDA appears to focus on information in the estuary itself. Efforts to further improve the information systems and integrate these are strongly supported.

<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.	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: (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 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.
3. Major revision required	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. 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.