

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: May 31, 2018
Screener: Virginia Gorsevski
Panel member validation by: Blake Ratner
Consultant(s):

I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	GEF TRUST FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	10041
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Regional (Marshall Islands, Palau, Tuvalu)
PROJECT TITLE:	Managing Coastal Aquifers in Selected Pacific SIDS
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	SPC; National Government Agencies in Palau, RMI and Tuvalu
GEF FOCAL AREA:	Multi Focal Area

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

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the project "Managing Coastal Aquifers in Selected Pacific SIDS" from UNDP. The objective of this project is "to improve the understanding, use, management and protection of coastal aquifers in Republic of Palau, Tuvalu and the Republic of Marshall Islands towards enhanced water security within the context of a changing climate."

Overall, the geographic coverage of targeted improved land management is very modest, but the vulnerability is very high and well documented through baseline analysis. The problems identified in the proposal are clearly stated and consistently related to project components; very well documented through cited studies. In addition, the assessment methodologies include innovative elements, likely applicable in other coastal watersheds, including integration of biophysical and socioeconomic measures. Crowdsourcing of monitoring data could also yield useful lessons on cost-effective approaches. Socioeconomic vulnerability is well integrated within the assessment approach and relevant projects are well linked.

STAP's only recommendation to improve this project relates to Project Outcome 3.2 "Knowledge platform put in place," noting that this is not an outcome. Rather, the outcome should describe some way in which the platform is used to further the project objective.

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
1. Concur	In cases where STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal, a simple "Concur" response will be provided; the STAP may flag specific issues that should be pursued rigorously as the proposal is developed into a full project document. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design prior to submission for CEO endorsement.

<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised. (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</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>
<p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</p> <p>The GEF Secretariat may, based on this screening outcome, delay the proposal and refer the proposal back to the proponents with STAP’s concerns.</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>