

Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility



STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: October 2, 2008

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams

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

Full size project **GEF Trust Fund**

GEFSEC Project ID: 3766

GEF agency Project ID: IADB: RG-X1011. UNEP: GF/1010-

Country(ies): Countries of the Wider Caribbean - Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Panama, Saint Lucia, Suriname

Project Title: Testing a Prototype

Caribbean Regional Fund for Wastewater Management (CRew)

GEF Agency(ies): IDB, UNEP

Other Executing partner(s): Caribbean Development Bank, UNEP CAR/RCU, Government Ministries, local municipalities, and wastewater management utilities

GEF Focal Area (s): International Waters

GEF-4 Strategic program(S): SP-2

Name of parent program/umbrella project: N/A

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 welcomes this innovative project that proposes to establish revolving financial mechanism for sustainable financing of wastewater management measures in the Wider Caribbean. Sewage is the most important pollution factor in the area and as such the Project's emphasis on improving wastewater management through a combination of policy reform and innovative financing is scientifically justified. The Project has high replication potential and a strong knowledge sharing component.
3. The Project development facility (PDF) is a crucial element in ensuring success of the Project through developing a continuous flow of "bankable" projects. It is not clear how the Project's components 1 and 2 are interlinked, i.e. how policy and technical advice informs investment decision-making at the PDF phase. Without a close coherence between investment decision making, policy reform and best scientific and technological advice, the project runs a risk of supporting ad-hoc interventions without significant impact on environmental status of watersheds and coastal waters. STAP recommends embedding an environmental quality assurance component (at the portfolio level) into the PDF facility to inform investment decisions.
4. A monitoring and evaluation part of the Component 1 measuring impact is not described in the PIF. It is recommended that the design of the M&E component at the project's preparation stage applies adaptive management approach (feedback loop). That said, STAP notes the excellent set of indicators developed for the Project.
5. STAP notes that few of the Caribbean countries (4 of 28) have signed the LBS Protocol and supports the implied Project intention (e.g., through the Project indicators) to encourage more countries to sign and adopt the provisions of the Protocol.

<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

	<p>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 revision required</p>	<p>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.</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>