

# 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 09, 2013

Screeners: Guadalupe Duron

Panel member validation by: Anand Patwardhan  
Consultant(s):

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT SPECIAL CLIMATE CHANGE FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID: 5263**

**PROJECT DURATION : 4**

**COUNTRIES : Cameroon**

**PROJECT TITLE: Enhancing the Resilience of Poor Communities to Urban Flooding in Yaounde**

**GEF AGENCIES: AfDB**

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:**

**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): **Major revision required**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP notes the SCCF proposal on "Enhancing the resilience of poor communities to urban flooding in Yaounde" submitted by the African Development Bank. The proposal intends to reduce poverty in Yaounde by improving its dwellers' capacity to adapt to climate change – mainly, on flood risk management. The proposed project deals with an important domain for climate change adaptation – urban vulnerability and resilience. Rapidly growing cities in the developing world that are exposed to flood risk constitute an important area for GEF interventions, and so the project could also have the potential for significant learning and approach validation. Unfortunately, as it stands now, the PIF has a number of deficiencies. STAP rates, therefore, the proposal as a major revision. It recommends for the following points to be addressed during the proposal development, and to provide a response to STAP describing how the proposal took into account the suggestions.

To strengthen the proposal, STAP recommends addressing the following points –

1. The proposed project would benefit from a more careful and thorough assessment of the current vulnerabilities in Yaounde. Squatter settlements are often located in hazardous regions due to a variety of economic and social factors – such as distance to workplace, the (un)availability of transportation and the possibility of encroaching on public lands. If some of these root causes are not identified and addressed, structural protection measures will have little effect, and may, in certain cases even lead to increased exposure and mal-adaptation. It would therefore be advantageous to also consider risk reduction and mitigation measures. Unless the proposed project, in some way, helps address the consequences of unplanned and uncontrolled urbanization, long-term climate change adaptation benefits are likely to be limited.
2. Furthermore, the emphasis in the project (at least in terms of the budget) appears to be on structural protection through "upgrading / rehabilitation of drainage canals and protection and cleaning of underdrains & canals". There is no indication of whether these structural measures would be adequate, or appropriate given future climate change. The PIF does not indicate whether there would be any systematic exercise to assess the continued effectiveness of such structural protection measures.
3. STAP believes the relationship between the baseline project and the SCCF project is not brought out clearly. How will the SCCF project modify (or enhance) the baseline interventions?
4. STAP recommends clarifying what is meant by "community-based adaptation infrastructure"? Some of the examples given in the PIF, such as: "Local drainage channels upgrading and maintenance; construction of local

retention ponds; construction/identification of community evacuation center; and climate proofing infrastructure and buildings" appear to be quite conventional flood protection measures. Apart from the question of their efficacy and value in climate change scenarios; there is little to distinguish them from the kind of interventions that could happen already in the baseline.

5. STAP believes the linkage of the project with "technology transfer" is rather tenuous. What "technologies" are hard or soft are proposed to be transferred? Much of the project deals with institutional and community-level capacity building – this is welcome, but it is hard to see this as "technology transfer".

6. In the project framework, STAP recommends specifying the outcome and output indicators. Doing so, will assist the African Development Bank to measure and monitor the intended activity. This will include assigning indicators on what will be measured (example – number of community adaptation plans developed). Additionally, the project developers may wish to review the output "local communities are promoted", given this statement appears to be miswritten.

7. In the project overview, it would be helpful to describe the general climate in Yaounde, and provide some data on trends or projections on climate change. This information could be obtained at the IPCC Data Distribution Centre, and the World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal. <http://sedac.ipcc-data.org/ddc/baseline/index.html> <http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm> Similarly, the project developers are recommended to include socio-economic data describing Yaounde's population. Together, the climate change and socio-economic data will strengthen the proposal description and the barriers it intends to address, and buttress further the rationale of the proposed interventions.

8. Additionally, STAP recommends detailing further the proposed adaptation measures, and their rationale for selection based on their effectiveness as an adaptation measure in the proposed socio-economic and climate risk context.

9. To strengthen further the rationale for the additional cost reasoning and define more clearly the adaptation benefits, STAP recommends specifying further the following aspects – i) define more explicitly the communities facing climate change risks (flooding risks) within Yaounde; ii) why are these communities vulnerable to climate change risks (flooding); iii) how will each proposed adaptation measures (flood risk management, others) reduce the communities' vulnerability to flooding and/or increase their adaptive capacity to address climate risks.

10. Additionally, this data will assist the project's monitoring, evaluation and knowledge learning on the effects of the interventions (example – community based adaptation) on reducing climate change vulnerability. During the proposal development, STAP recommends establishing, therefore, more explicit links between the proposed adaptation measures and the project's monitoring, evaluation, and knowledge management activities.

11. STAP is pleased to see the proposal aims to contribute to mainstreaming adaptation measures into Yaounde's urban planning. Doing so will help address the different factors influencing risks (e.g. flood hazards, and deficiencies in response mechanisms) across a spectrum of sectors (social, economic, cultural, institutional) that can help strengthen Yaounde's resilience to climate risks. One source of information the project developers may wish to consider when developing this section further is as follows – Wamsler, C. et al. "Planning for change in urban areas: from theory to practice". 2013. Journal of Cleaner Production. The document includes a framework for urban planning on adaptation (figure 2) based on a meta-analysis of studies on urban adaptation measures and their implementation in developing and developed countries.

12. Furthermore, STAP recommends specifying the stakeholders' (identified in section A.2) roles in relation to mainstreaming adaptation in Yaounde's urban development planning, and in relation to the project's components – specifying the stakeholders' comparative advantages.

13. Finally, one of the key questions in urban vulnerability & resilience is the sustainability of the interventions and their contribution to long-term resilience. Integrated approaches are indeed required, but unfortunately, while the project makes the (correct) argument for integrated approaches, it does not clearly spell out the way in which integration will be achieved.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	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.

	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.
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<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 STAP's recommended actions.</p>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<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>