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: 13 March 2008 Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams

I. PIF Information

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 2586
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 3311
COUNTRY(IES): Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu,Vanuatu
PROJECT TITLE: Implementing Sustainable Integrated Water Resource and Wastewater Management in the Pacific Island Countries
GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP/UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC)
GEF FOCAL AREA (S): International Waters
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): IW SP3: Balancing Overuse and Conflicting Uses of Water Resources in Transboundary Surface and Groundwater Basins.
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: PACIFIC ALLIANCE FOR SUSTAINABILITY (PAS)

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. For each of the catchments to be used as demonstration sites, good baseline information should be established, along with monitoring and evaluation procedures to establish progress. The specification of specific targets in the Expected Outputs is a very positive development.

STAP advisory response	*Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed*
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.