

# 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: March 16, 2009

Screener: Douglas Taylor, STAP Secretary

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams

### I. PIF Information

#### Full size project      GEF Trust Fund

GEF PROJECT ID: 3887      PROJECT DURATION: 6 yrs

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 41224

COUNTRY: Philippines

PROJECT TITLE: Agusan River Basin Integrated Water Resources  
Management Project

GEF AGENCY: ADB

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER: Department of Environment and  
Natural Resources

GEF FOCAL AREAS: Biodiversity, International Waters

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): BD: SP-3,4,5,7; IW: SP-2

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) Program

### 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 Agusan Basin and its marsh system is a significant and unique water system under serious threat from human use, some of which pressure can be potentially alleviated by concerted planning and integrated planning and management. Thus, this proposed investment project, which will work to strengthen institutions at catchment scale, is welcomed.
3. The PIF is well prepared to the extent that it describes the area, its values and challenges clearly and accurately. The plans are well in line with the Philippine Government policies and plans but, as the implementation of the plans and activities must be backed by well defined performance monitoring. Performance indicators do not seem to be yet developed and care will be needed to ensure that the respective roles of the UNDP and ADB interventions are clearly coordinated and the outcomes of all are assessable by appropriate indicators.

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.