

# 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: @@@@ @@, @@@@  
Screener: Sarah Lebel  
Panel member validation by: Anand Patwardhan  
Consultant(s):

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

FULL-SIZED PROJECT	LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	8036
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Bangladesh
PROJECT TITLE:	Integrating Climate Change Adaptation into Sustainable Development Pathways of Bangladesh
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Environment and Forests, Planning Commission, the Finance Division (Ministry of Finance), Local Government Division, Disaster Management and Relief, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, Ministry of Women and Children Affairs, Office of the Auditor General and the National Parliament
GEF FOCAL AREA:	Climate Change

### 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 UNDP proposal "Integrating climate change adaptation into sustainable development pathways of Bangladesh". This PIF proposes to support the National Adaptation Plan process in Bangladesh by strengthening climate and socio-economic information databases, as well as mainstreaming climate change adaptation across policies, plans, strategies, with a special focus on sensitive agro-ecosystems. While the PIF is overall quite sound in terms of its scientific and technical content, STAP would encourage UNDP to consider the following suggestions and observations during the course of project development and implementation. As always, STAP welcomes further engagement with the proponent with regard to project design, prior to CEO endorsement.

1. STAP welcomes the emphasis in the PIF on regarding the NAP as an on-going and long-term process, rather than simply the preparation of a plan document. In that regard, STAP encourages the proponents to consider ways to institutionalize the process into existing (or modified) decision-making and planning structures. This could actually be reflected as an output associated with Outcome 3. Similarly, some of the outputs (for example outputs 1, 2, 4 in Outcome 2) could be formulated to reflect the fact that these activities are not one-time efforts, but rather the project should seek to create a process that will allow them to be undertaken on an on-going basis.

2. Bangladesh's INDC (submitted in September 2015) includes goals and actions related to adaptation. These need to be captured and would certainly need to be reflected in the project document for CEO endorsement "to ensure that the NAP process is integrally connected to, and supports, NDC implementation.

3. STAP welcomes the linkages with disaster management, and recommends that these synergies be emphasized in the NAP process. Further, STAP also welcomes the emphasis on a cross-sectoral approach, with specific attention to engaging the Planning and Finance ministries and other line ministries.

4. Analysis of future climate related hazards (output 1 in Outcome 1) should consider not only different climate scenarios, but also a range of socio-economic futures. This will be key for the assessment of future vulnerability, given the rapid socio-economic changes in Bangladesh. The SSP-RCP scenario matrix architecture may be helpful in this regard. Institutionalizing the process of vulnerability assessment by creating an in-country network of institutions and human capacity should be an explicit output.

5. Will the resources in this project actually be adequate to achieve output 5 of Outcome 2 ("implement priority adaptation interventions in line with NAPA priorities")?

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Concur</b>	<p>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>
<b>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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>
<b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b>	<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>