

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: February 24, 2014

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Jakob Granit
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5674

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Regional (Uganda, Congo DR)

PROJECT TITLE: Lakes Edward and Albert Integrated Fisheries and Water Resources Management Project

GEF AGENCIES: AfDB

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Nile Basin Initiative (NBI)

GEF FOCAL AREA: International Waters

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):
Minor revision required

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. STAP welcomes the proposal in this PIF on the management of fisheries resources and to strengthen transboundary management of shared water resources and linked common pool resources across the boundaries of the basins of Lakes Edward and Albert and their associated ecosystems. The project concept builds upon results achieved in a pre-investment and foundational capacity building project implemented by NELSAP/NBI, Uganda and DRC with support of AfDB. The original scope of work was identified already in early 2000 by the two countries within the framework of the NBI. The shared resources in this part of the Great Lakes region could serve as a model for identifying joint and innovative cooperative processes building on and supporting larger multi-purpose cooperative frameworks such as the Nile, COMESA and the EAC.
2. STAP recommends that the project design is subject to Minor Revision, and that the proponents consider carefully the advice provided below.
3. The initial implementation phase that was carried out demonstrated the possibility to cooperate but also the inherent challenges in the region related to poverty and civil strife. Some of these challenges are identified in the PIF under the heading "barriers" [to cooperation]. The approach to build on analysis and results in the first phase, update the Integrated Lake Management Plans including broader NELSAP SEAs carried out substituting traditional TDA/SAP approaches is welcomed and should possibly fast track the establishment of sustainable institutional frameworks at the bilateral level including a focus on investments that should have been identified in the originally produced ILMPs. During project preparation the results of the first cooperative phase should be clearly spelled out to support the detailed design of the proposed GEF/AfDB project.
4. The proposed work to implement action programs, build capacity and put into place integrated transboundary water resource and catchment management is generally well-targeted, and builds on many foundational data sets and situation reports. Nevertheless, STAP cautions, regarding project design, that some of the proposed project components are over-ambitious, particularly for example Output 2.4 on water resources etc., including some un-clarity regarding aspects of regional governance (NELSAP) and country participating agency roles (see further below).
5. The project has the potential to establish or to consolidate baseline data and management best practice for major ecosystem components and to build a reservoir of expertise to sustain, at least in the medium

term, the natural resource potential of the lake basins. A coordinated ICT strategy for all data and information produced in the proposed project should be explored in the project preparation phase – possibly at NELSAP or linked to another institutional framework that is robust. Much data has been generated in the first AfDB financed project and more will be created. Accessibility and transparency in data protocols is critical for trust building and future investment projects.

6. The project benefits from Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Program (NELSAP) advice and support in project preparation and implementation where NELSAP operates as a de facto joint institution in the absence of robust bilateral agreements. The role of NELSAP vis-à-vis the participating institutions in the two countries towards the end of the project should be defined and clarified during project designed.

7. Regarding diagnostic analysis, the foundation for the project concept. The PIF states that the Lakes Edward and Albert Fisheries pilot Project (LEAF) diagnostic analysis forms the basis for identifying the challenges to be addressed. In addition STAP advises the proponents to consider the findings of related studies e.g. on Lake George fisheries, mining activities and pollution and to review FAO reports on post-harvest fish technology in Uganda, which may usefully complement the existing knowledge base including from the oil exploration sector.

8. Regarding fisheries, the PIF may underestimate the species diversity in the lakes, for example recent IUCN estimates cite about 80 taxa of fish in Lake Edward but does not mention the very different mix of commercially exploited species in Lake Albert. The PIF confusingly refers to 24 species in the two basins yet cites 60 endemic cichlid species; therefore the full project brief should revisit this issue. Deforestation is a well-known consequence of poorly managed post-harvest fish processing, cited under Barrier #2, which will be addressed by the project. However, while the PIF describes (under Output 1.5) introducing modern fish drying techniques and smoking methods, there is no mention of complementary actions to monitor and to reduce informal/inefficient fish processing, without which overall deforestation pressure may not reduce, especially if the export market is further developed.

9. The experience of invasive species control, especially for Eichhornia crassipes in Lake Victoria will be valuable in assessing the sustainable methods to be applied to the lakes; Output 1.7 makes an assumption that only mechanical means are to be considered, this assumption should be tested, given that weevils have previously been used on Lake Edward.

10. The Expected Outcome 2.2 specifies capacity built but this is not clearly delivered by any specific action within the PIF which in several places mentions strengthening capacities and training but not how or by whom this is to be achieved. This is a vital component of the entire project, the sustainable outcomes of which fundamentally depend on strategic and local capacity built to integrate scientific, technical and traditional knowledge sectors. The full project brief should clearly present, preferably through a separate Component, a framework for capacity building and knowledge management.

11. During the project preparation phase these broader region based institutional frameworks needs to be considered especially since the NBI is not a Regional Economic Commission as stated in the PIF. What would the role be of the EAC in the context of cooperation with a non-EAC member (DRC)?

12. Finally, there is no mention in the PIF of the use of overall indicators for monitoring and evaluation of the project, this should be addressed during project preparation and possible links to an overall ICT strategy (at NELSAP and the relevant agencies) be clarified

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:</p> <p>(i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions.</p> <p>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to</p>

	STAP's recommended actions.
3. Major revision required	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:</p> <p>(i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP.</p> <p>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</p>