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: 25 June 2008 Screener: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Michael Stocking

I. PIF Information *(Paste here from the PIF)*

Full size project GEF Trust Fund

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 2929
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: PIMS 2890
COUNTRY(IES): Dominican Republic, Haiti
PROJECT TITLE: Reducing conflicting water uses in the Artibonite River basin through development and adoption of a multi-focal area Strategic Action Programme
GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): Dominican Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources, Haitian Ministry of Environment, Haitian Ministry of Agriculture, FAO, Oxfam-Quebec
GEF FOCAL AREA (S): International Waters, Land Degradation
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): IW SP3, LD SP 1

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. The Artibonite River forms a major (321 km) transboundary water system with Haiti and the Dominican Republic. Not only has the river's catchment suffered serious deforestation but also there is substantial competition for the water resources. It is understood that this is the first system-wide initiative to try to control land degradation and to integrate water-related needs and concerns of people in the upper and lower parts of the catchment. This project is to be welcomed in addressing these complex issues for IWRM and for having relevant, up-to-date objectives in attempting to promote ecosystem-based reforms and long-term functionality of the system.

   STAP is happy with the essential scientific logic of the project and that the GEF funding will help to link the many baseline initiatives (USD30 million) to overcome the several persistent barriers to system-wide integration and up-scaling. This is in conformity with the Strategic Objectives in the two focal areas – IW and LD. The proposed scientific procedures – an initial TDA including causal chain analysis; formulation of SAPs; mainstreaming into national planning; and on-the-ground demonstrations – are rational and sensible. STAP particularly welcomes the explicit focus on synergies and "indelible linkages" both spatially and thematically (IW-LD-BD). The project approach conforms to current thinking on the importance of adopting an ecosystem approach to such complex problems. STAP advises that, when completing the full project Document, it would be good to strengthen the section on anticipated global environmental benefits (end of Part II, Section A) to include some quantitative assessments of the benefits to reducing land degradation, protecting biodiversity, enhancing transboundary water resources and preventing GHG emissions. [NB – there are some mentions of GEBs in Section E 'incremental reasoning' which should be integrated with a more robust assessment of the beneficial impacts these investments will generate]. This will to some extent be guesswork at this stage, but it will focus the project implementers on the need to monitor project impact in these GEB aspects.

   STAP also advises that it would be good to draw attention to the methods of analysis and of project implementation when completing the full Project Brief. For example, Causal Chain Analysis exists in a variety of forms, and under different names. As a means of tracing the immediate or direct causes of an impact or problem back to its root causes, it is relevant to the TDA for this project and to on-going monitoring and evaluation of project impact. However, as a number of studies have indicated (e.g. http://www.enterprise-impact.org.uk/word-files/SIASection5.doc), it is often that the immediate cause of an impact is not its fundamental cause. Tackling the direct cause may not solve the problem; tackling the

root cause may solve more than one problem. The more fundamental causes of existing problems need to be understood for use in impact assessments. There is good advice in the scientific literature on this, as well as on other methodological aspects.

.

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.