

# Component B: Water Quality

## Regional Level Review Outcomes

**Chair:** Dr. YVES JEAN MICHEL Mong, Centre national de Recherches sur l'environnement (CNRE), Madagascar

**Deputy Chair:** Dr. Richard Joseph Kimwaga, University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

**Members:**

**Dr. Daniel Munga**, Technical University of Mombasa, Kenya

**Dr. Motebang Dominic Vincent**, Walter Sisulu University, South Africa

**Ian Gerard CHARLETTE**, Ian Consulting, Seychelles

## MAIN HIGHLIGHTS

- Five (5) concept notes were submitted for review
- Four (4) reviewed by experts from this component
- One (1) reviewed by experts from River Flow
- Agreed on the compilation and synthesis format
- Each concept note was reviewed by three experts
- Decision by majority was agreed. However, minority was given consideration
- All five (5) submitted concept notes have been recommended for full proposal development stage
- All five (5) submitted concept notes didn't present the 'THEORY OF CHANGE'
- Results Based Matrix (RBM) to be seriously considered
- Need to build capacity and skill on those areas that have been identified to be rather weak and inadequate

**Concept Note 1: Improving Mtwapa Creek water quality by use of Constructed Wetland technology for wastewater treatment model in Shimo la Tewa Prison’ – IMCoW Project**

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
Sufficiency of background and justification of the proposed intervention	Yes. Not entirely but could be completed. The argument justifying financial capacity to maintain and run the facility beyond WIO-SAP support should be completed with enough guaranties of the same challenges not to reproduce again for administrative reason or lack of good governance of prison finance. Also, training on simple test of wetland performance	YES Comments: The concept has highlighted an inadequate wastewater management system at Shimo la Tewa that could have impacts to marine and coastal pollution	YES, Comments: The funding issue for rehabilitation of the existing system has been highlighted as well as the sensitivity .			Yes, well articulated. However the details should be provided in the full proposal development

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
	<p>should be given to responsible of the prison. Finally, as all sanitation infrastructure donated to community, approach to rise ownership must be emphasize so as to increase the interest of beneficiaries to keep the donated infrastructure running even beyond WIOSAP intervention.</p>					
<p>Objectives clear, aligned to the problem statement/justification and achievable within the project timeframe of 2.5 years and with the proposed budget</p>	<p>Yes, the objectives will address the technical problems encountered and achievable within the project</p>	<p>YES Comments: For each objective, the concept note has highlighted the activities to be carried out/conducted</p>	<p>Yes. Comments: However, the budget ceiling of US\$300,000 may not be enough for the population size (5,000).</p>			<p>Yes, however, the proposed action should be refined to match the project duration and budget</p>

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
	timeframe. It remains to give more time and emphasis to the social part so as to ensure the ownership of the infrastructure by the prison people					
Expected results aligned to the proposed objectives	Technically, yes, but as mentioned above, give more weight to social aspect	To some extent YES Comments: Unfortunately the concept note doesn't explicitly present the results for the proposed action	Yes			Yes, the proposed action results (output, outcome and impacts should be improved.
Regional relevance and thus potential for replication/up-scaling beyond the proposed site/country	Yes, the project would be relevant for certain countries not very familiar with wetland technology (Madagascar, Comoros)	YES Comments: The concept has presented a number of relevant initiatives at national, regional and global level	Yes, Comments: but possibly for small a smaller sized community. However, caution to note that wastewater criteria (in terms of biochemical parameters) from			Yes, the proposed approach/method can be applied elsewhere

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
			prisons are from other sources (e.g. schools, villages).			
Concept benefit from major/further technical input	No, except testing more vegetation before definitive selection	Yes	Yes. Comments: From an expert in pollution control and environmental engineering for such form of treatment (Artificial wetland) with good background in ecology.			Yes, to find an alternative substrate materials (vegetation growing media)  Also to have hybrid system of horizontal and vertical wetland so as to maximize the treatment capacity
Would you recommend this concept for consideration for full proposal development	Yes, provided enough guaranties from beneficiaries and enough contribution from them either financially or financially in kind to ensure strong ownership	YES This is sound concept that that it has been able to address not only the required format but also the contents as per the call for request for concept note.	Yes. Refer to point No. 6. Also the maintenance of such is high given the seemingly natural treatment process. The issue of harvesting of plants used in the system may (?) have been overlooked. If that is not the			Yes

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
			<p>case then the responsible person will have to ensure that the harvested plants are stored conveniently.</p>			
<p>Any major comments/recommendations</p>	<p>Normally, as constructed wetland is a well mastered technology, only by neglecting vital aspect of the life cycle of the project would lead to such failure after benefiting from WIO-LAB support. The question is that, whether the project proponent has learnt lessons from previous failure because</p>	<p>Title should read 'Improving Mtwapa Creek water quality by use of Constructed Wetland <b>Wastewater Treatment</b> technology for <del>wastewater treatment model</del> in Shimo la Tewa' instead of 'Improving Mtwapa Creek water quality by use of Constructed Wetland technology for wastewater treatment model in Shimo la Tewa Prison' – IMCoW Project</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A site plan for the proposal may have been useful.</li> <li>• The ease of getting approval for the system may be issue if it is not in government land</li> <li>• Caution of the downstream sensitive environment or receiving body.</li> </ul>			<p>Incorporate the comments from all the three reviewers</p>

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
	<p>while wetland is a low-cost technology, the key aspect for success remains to ensure good maintenance that necessitates minimum funding by beneficiary</p>					
<b>Experts Recommendations</b>	Concept note recommended for full proposal development					

## Concept Note 2: Wastewater treatment in Seychelles

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
Sufficiency of background and justification of the proposed intervention		No: Justification in relation to the proposed action is missing. Statement of the problem is not supported by facts on the ground. What is the current status on the ground?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The concept paper provides sufficient background in which the problem is clearly defined and the significance of the proposal well articulated</li> <li>• In addition, the proposal, is in line with national priorities and strategies with the overall goal of prevention and controlling water pollution and ensuring environmental health.</li> <li>• There are other government</li> </ul>		Yes. More background and justification. Statement of the problem need to be clarified, added and refined



Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
				programmes that will complement the proposed project, which will ensure sustainability of the proposed project.		
Objectives clear, aligned to the problem statement/justification and achievable within the project timeframe of 2.5 years and with the proposed budget		Needs rephrasing. Immediate objectives not clearly articulated		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The objectives are not clearly or explicitly stated. Thus it is not possible to objectively assess the viability of the proposed project.</li> </ul> <p>However, the overall goal of the proposal can be deduced to be two pilot studies on anaerobic treatment of waste matter and slurry from two separate communities</p>		Objectives are not explicitly stated. There is need for refining the specific objectives
Expected results aligned to		Set of		The expected		The expected

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
the proposed objectives		results in terms of outputs, outcomes and impacts need to be well articulated		results have not been defined. This is understood to be a consequence of the lack of clearly defined objectives		results have not been defined. This is understood to be a consequence of the lack of clearly defined objectives
Regional relevance and thus potential for replication/up-scaling beyond the proposed site/country		In a way YES. It is in line with WIOSAP		The proposed project has regional relevance and has the potential of generating useful lessons for other countries		Yes. Regional and national initiatives to support the proposed action are presented. However, wastewater treatment technology need to be clearly defined
Concept benefit from major/further technical input		Yes. Need that concept note format be abide and technical contents be updated		The concept requires further technical input to ensure the development of viable designs and construction of waste treatment		Yes. Refinement of immediate objectives and selection of appropriate wastewater treatment technologies

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
				facilities and useful products.		
Would you recommend this concept for consideration for full proposal development		This concept note comes from main-stream government institution. It is plausible intervention. But it needs further technical support to make it sound and competent		The concept is recommended for full proposal development subject to refining of the objectives, activities and outputs		This concept note comes from main-stream government institution. It is plausible intervention. But it needs further technical support to make it sound and competent
Any major comments/recommendations		Provide the title in the concept note		It is recommended that the proposal targets one pilot project for development of a waste treatment facility. Lessons learnt can then be used for replication in other sites		It is recommended that the proposal targets one pilot project for development of a waste treatment facility. Lessons learnt can then be used for replication in other sites

**Concept Note 3:** Investigating the causes and impacts of impaired water quality on the living marine resources and associated dependent communities in order to develop / improve national standards and guidelines of water quality maintenance

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
Sufficiency of background and justification of the proposed intervention	No, the background and justification of the demo project is not sufficient because while the issues (sources of pollution) to be addressed are common for the WIO countries, the root causes of the estuary's water quality degradation affecting the marine water leading it to be unfit for users are not well explained (inadequate governance or lack of	Yes, The concept provides a bit of sources of pollution.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The concept provides sufficient background in which the problem is clearly defined and the significance of the proposal well articulated</li> <li>•In addition, the proposal, is in line with national priorities and strategies with the overall goal of monitoring and controlling water pollution.</li> </ul> <p>There are other</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Yes. The concept provides sufficient background in which the problem is clearly defined and the significance of the proposal well articulated</li> </ul>

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
	<p>institutional capacity and effective policy framework or lack of standards?) for a country like South Africa already well advanced in tackling these issues (ex Durban is using colored flag for communicating and sensitizing on water quality and beach cleanliness) or the issue is specific to estuary. Needs further clarification following template format.</p>			<p>government programmes that will complement the proposed project, which will ensure sustainability of the project</p>		

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
Objectives clear, aligned to the problem statement/justification and achievable within the project timeframe of 2.5 years and with the proposed budget	Yes, the objectives are clear, aligned to the problem statement and achievable within the project timeframe the main pillar to support the implementation of the project, the National Water Quality Monitoring Laboratory, would be already functional and the project could find additional funding from national stakeholders if necessary.	There is a need to align the title, statement of the problem and objectives. Also, try to write in the correct verb		A list of objectives is given. The objectives can be further refined, aligning them with the problem statement		A list of objectives is given. The objectives can be further refined, aligning them with the problem statement

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
	One question concerns the strategy to get private sector involved and support the development or improvement of the national standards.					
Expected results aligned to the proposed objectives	Yes, the expected results are completely aligned to the proposed objectives even though the relationship with the oceans and coasts water quality monitoring programme needs more clarification	Yes, There is need to explicitly bring out the alignment between specific objectives and results. The way it is, there is very little alignment between the results and objectives.		The expected results have not been clearly aligned to the proposed objectives. Development of a logical framework (at the full proposal development stage) should bring about clarity on the		Yes. The expected should be clearly aligned to the proposed objectives

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
	as it seems to be the element that provides sustainability to the project outputs beyond the timeframe. Also need to specify the kind of risk that could hamper the success of the demo project.			objectives and expected results or outputs.		
Regional relevance and thus potential for replication/up-scaling beyond the proposed site/country	Yes, no doubt the project has relevance at regional level as most WIO countries experience similar problem, so approach to get relevant stakeholders involved and engaged,	Yes, Monitoring of Water Quality along the coastal area and thus protect the marine and coastal area		The proposed project has regional relevance, with a link to SAPPHIRE, and has the potential of generating useful lessons for other countries.		Yes. The proposed project has regional relevance, with a link to SAPPHIRE, and has the potential of generating useful lessons for other countries. Monitoring



Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
	particularly local community through cultural aspect and private sector, and coordinate their actions would be good lesson to be replicated to other WIO countries					of Water Quality along the coastal area and thus protect the marine and coastal area
Concept benefit from major/further technical input	Yes, major technical input will be the primordial condition of the concept to be successful, as for example in terms of wastewater treatment technology	Yes, It has some good ideas and concepts towards marine and coastal environmental protection.		The concept requires further refining, particularly, streamlining the objectives and expected outputs. The application of appropriate environment		Yes. Water quality and management modeling tools Designing of Water Quality Monitoring programme (WQMP)

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
				al or mathematical models should be explored		
Would you recommend this concept for consideration for full proposal development	No, the concept note should provide more information according to the provided template before being acceptable for full proposal	Yes. Need to improve		The concept is recommended for full proposal development subject to refining of the objectives, activities and linking to the outputs.		The concept is recommended for full proposal development subject to refining of the objectives, activities and linking to the outputs.
Any major comments/recommendations	Concept note to be rewritten must show strong justification of the proposed actions and how coherent they are in order to	Title needs to be rephrased to be more specific. One would wonder what is this work all about? Is it about investigating		It is recommended that the scope (e.g. parameters, sampling sites) of the proposed project be well defined to ensure viability.		It is recommended that the scope (e.g. parameters, sampling sites) of the proposed project be well defined to ensure viability.

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
	<p>achieve the main objective. Also should be indicated the financial participation of the proponent. Avoid mixing up everything just in order to stick to what is required by WIO SAP</p>	<p>sources and impacts or about improving water quality standards and guidelines?/ The demonstration part of the proposed action is not clearly articulated</p>		<p>Lessons learnt can be used for replication in the region</p>		<p>Lessons learnt can be used for replication in the region</p>
<b>Experts Recommendations</b>	Concept Note recommended for full proposal development					

**Concept Note 4:** Improvement of ecosystem health and water quality by implementing a Source to Sea based approach to tackle marine litter in five priority river systems in Durban, Kwazulu-Natal, South Africa

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
Sufficiency of background and justification of the proposed intervention			Yes Comments : Reference has been made to scientific information from a 2015 study	The background on Source to sea initiatives in RSA is well presented with substantial detail. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Existing source to sea initiatives are highlighted which gives an indication of experience in such initiatives. National interests in terms of a programme on marine litter justify</li></ul>	Tole: Yes, Water Quality has been viewed along perspectives of pollution resulting from chemical and biological impurities, and standards are well established along these quality parameters. It is assumed that suspended solids (TSS) can easily be removed by filtration.	Yes. Sufficient background and justification presented

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
				<p>the proposal and potential partnerships provide an appreciable level of sustainability of the proposed project.</p>	<p>However, the issue of plastics (and specifically microplastics) in water has raised concerns that even suspended solids should be of concern, and be dealt with. This proposal looks at water quality from the perspective of suspended solids in water bodies, although it is not clear that microplastics will be specifically</p>	

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
					targeted	
Objectives clear, aligned to the problem statement/justification and achievable within the project timeframe of 2.5 years and with the proposed budget			Yes, Provided that the communities along the study area have been mobilized or can easily be mobilized	The objectives are not explicitly defined, and hence pose a challenge in assessing the achievability of the proposed project and determining verifiable outputs. The objectives need to be clearly articulated in line with the title of the proposal	No, There is mix up of plastics pollution assessments , and clean up actions	There is need to relook and refine objectives to be in line with problem statement/justification.
Expected results aligned to the proposed objectives			Not really, The possibility that the river gets more plastic	With no clear objectives, no unambiguous expected results or outputs have	No, There is a mix up of assessments and actual clean up actions. There is	There is need to align the objectives to the expected results more clearly

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
			wastes as the project is implemented is a concern.	been defined	need to align the objectives to the expected outputs more clearly	
Regional relevance and thus potential for replication/up-scaling beyond the proposed site/country			Yes, Other countries possibly have similar problems and possibly more	The ideas behind the project have regional relevance, and the project can be upscaled beyond the target study sites. However, this is subject to revising the proposal with reference to the guidelines provided by PMU	Yes, As noted above, the issue of plastics in the environment has gained prominence in recent years. It is a worldwide problem, and there is need to come up with regional and global solutions and standards on the issue before it escalates	Yes. There is need for clarity on the objectives that will give clear methodology to be replicated elsewhere.

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
					further	
Concept benefit from major/further technical input			No, The proposal seems to suggest that they already have the capabilities	The proposal needs to be revised to identify components of the national programme to be supported, and this may require further technical input.	It needs further clarification of the action plans that will meet the objectives of the project. The issue of microplastics may need to be more clearly highlighted, if it is to be viewed as a water quality component issue	Yes. Need to refine the objectives to remove the ambiguity. The issue of microplastics to be incorporated into the proposal to make it fit better into a water quality component project
Would you recommend this concept for consideration for full proposal development			No, The fact that other supporting actions such as prevention seems to suggest that the	Yes, the environmental issue the proposed project is focusing on, that is marine litter control is an area of	Yes, but with the incorporation of assessment of nano plastics in water. The issue of developmen	Yes. The proposed action is in line with WIOSAP priority areas and for the national interest



Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
			project will go beyond 2 years.	concern and priority in the LBSA protocol. Thus the proposed project is of regional interest and can be replicated. In addition, the proposal has national interests, with the government supporting a programme addressing marine litter	t of standards of microplastics concentrations in water for various uses would strengthen the proposal further	
Any major comments/recommendations				The concept can be considered for further development, subject to revision of the concept to provide clear focus and defined	There is an issue as to whether the projects fits in with the traditional understanding of water quality issues, which have	

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
				scope, as per the guidelines provided by the PMU.	been viewed from chemical and microbiological pollutant perspectives . Solids have been assumed to be easily managed through water filtration, and therefore not aspects of concern in water quality. However, the realization that nanoparticles from plastics are entering the food web has brought to the fore	

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
					the fact that water quality should be protected for organisms in addition to human consumption uses. It is proposed that aspects of microplastics be incorporated into the proposal to make it fit better into a water quality component project	
<b>Experts Recommendation</b>	Concept Note is recommended for full proposal development					

**Concept Note 5:** Strengthening regulatory framework and national capacity for monitoring effluent discharges, water, and sediments quality in coastal and marine areas of Madagascar

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
Sufficiency of background and justification of the proposed intervention			JK: Yes, There is a missing link between the problem of inadequate equipment and the lack of a framework and an effective legal basis for combating sources of pollution of land-based origin. It would have been good to provide some highlights on the nature of	YES: A compelling case is made for the study is made. Pollution is primarily sediment and nutrients, agricultural and sewage/industrial effluents. The site was also identified as priority in the previous project (WIO LAB). Furthermore, description of the location (drivers, volumes of sediment and socioecological significance) make a compelling case for the site selected. CNRES has been conducting monitoring of water quality for a few years therefore there is an ongoing effort by a government institution which is great for project	Yes, The project proposes to build up on activities previously undertaken during the WIO LAB project. This element of continuity is commendable	Yes. However, the proposed action has a missing link between the problem of inadequate equipment and the lack of a framework and an effective legal basis for combating sources of pollution of land-based origin.

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
			the existing regulatory framework, the weaknesses and then identify the gap that the project wants to bridge.	sustainability. It would have been good to show some of the results from the ongoing efforts (albeit some were presented) during the technical workshop. An interesting case of the use of bioindicators (forams) of pollution. More importantly, it is setup to leverage on an ongoing process		
Objectives clear, aligned to the problem statement/justification and achievable within the project timeframe of 2.5 years and with the proposed budget			No, There are 3 main objectives and 7 specific objectives. These are too many for a research project. Must be	Yes The objective seems to address key components of the nonpoint source pollution – addressing regulatory/policy framework, generating new knowledge with respect to pollution and ecosystems, and evaluating the impacts on	No, The objectives need to be made SMART. Currently, they are couched in terms like: “develop”, “assess”, “review”, “evaluate”, “adopt”,	Yes. The objectives need to be made SMART. Some of the objectives need to be merged to be in line with problem statement/justification. Objectives need to be refined to be achieved within project time and

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
			reconsidered and some merged	ecosystems. I wondered whether compliance/enforcement of existing regulation is an issue because often the problem is not lack of adequate legislation but their enforcement. This may need to be incorporated within the objectives setting	“validate”. These are not measurable	budget framework.
Expected results aligned to the proposed objectives			No, Somehow but will need to be adjusted to match with the revised objectives	This might need to be revisited. While the authors have aligned some of the objectives to expected results, the outputs for the following objectives are not anticipated in <b>IV. A.</b> and seems to have fallen through the cracks in the following sections of the proposal	Yes, However, the targets of the objectives need to be clarified, so that progress can be measurable.	Somehow. However, they need to be reviewed to align to the proposed objectives.
Regional relevance and thus potential for			Yes, Innovative	Yes, The issues presented are	Yes, The innovative	Yes. The methodology and

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
replication/up-scaling beyond the proposed site/country			findings from the research could be useful for up-scaling to other WIO countries	typical of most estuaries in the region. The most interesting aspect of this proposal is the ongoing use of bioindicator (foraminifera).	use of foraminifera as sentinel organisms, if confirmed, would be useful for adoption as a regional approach to pollution monitoring	approach of the proposed action can be replicated elsewhere
Concept benefit from major/further technical input			Yes, There is a need to refine the main objective and the specific objectives to make them more relevant and focused together with the	Yes As part of the objectives, the project may need to state explicitly if and how they plan to evaluate the indicator, or to couple and test various types of indicators.  Linkages to ecosystems not clear, this is an area that may need improvement i.e.	Yes, But only in sharpening the objectives	Yes. The refinement of the objectives to produce the desired results

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
			<p>associated outputs and indicators.</p>	<p>testing the ecological impacts and threats mapping</p> <p>Sediment is mentioned but not in greater detail as with nutrients. Authors should decide whether sedimentation should be part of the proposed project, in which case strengthen that component, or delete it altogether.</p> <p>Technology (Remote Sensing) would need to be brought onboard, this could leverage on existing regional projects such as GMES on application of earth observation technology for environmental assessments</p>		



Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
<p>Would you recommend this concept for consideration for full proposal development</p>			<p>Yes, Further refinement of the concept idea is required to make it smarter and clearer. It is clear that the project will leverage on the existing monitoring network with additional installations, but the linkage with the Institutional Framework desired for is not clearly</p>	<p>Yes, concept setting provides a good case given that it presents typical challenges experiences throughout similar locations in the region therefore it scores on scalability and relevance</p>	<p>Yes, builds on previous work supported by the Nairobi Convention, and has commendable elements of continuity inbuilt into it; (ii) It brings to the fore use of sentinel organisms which may be useful for regional adoption.</p>	<p>Yes. However, refine the objectives and make them SMART.</p>

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
			defined			
Any major comments/recommendations			<p>Strengthen the specific objectives to make them SMART</p> <p>Revise the objectives to make them relevant</p> <p>Strengthen the outputs and make them relevant to the objectives</p>	<p>A decision support tool is mentioned but not explicitly described as an objective. It appears to be presented here as an afterthought and may need to be properly within the relevant sections of the concept.</p> <p>Association to the SCG needs to be specific. i.e. (SDG14.?)</p> <p>Not much information/background is provided with regards to sedimentation. The project is heavy on Nutrients, and therefore perhaps it should either completely remove the sediment component or omit from the proposal.</p>	<p>The project deserves support for the two reasons given in (8) above</p>	<p>Specific objectives to be SMART. Provide the detail of decision support tool and how it is going to be applied in this case.</p>

Criterion	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Reviewer 4	Reviewer 5	Consolidated Comments
				some of the weaknesses mentioned may need to be addressed such as clearly tying the objectives to outcomes/outputs/results		

**General Observation.**

All concept notes submitted have not presented the 'Theory of Change'

All concept notes don't articulately present the 'Results Based Matrix - RBM'