

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:	8023
PROJECT DURATION:	3
COUNTRIES:	Guinea
PROJECT TITLE:	Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems for Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change in Guinea
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Direction Nationale de la Météorologie- Ministère des Transports
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):
Minor issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the UNDP proposal "Strengthening climate information and early warning systems for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change in Guinea". The project targets the agricultural and mining sectors, as they represent some of the most important economic areas of the country, yet also some of the most vulnerable to changing rainfall patterns and overall water availability. While STAP finds the PIF to be reasonably sound and well-developed, we would like to offer a number of suggestions to strengthen the project; that may be incorporated during the process of project development:

1. It is important to distinguish between different areas of application of climate information and decision-making contexts – specifically between responding to acute hazards (early warning systems) and considering climate risks in long-term planning (for example water resource management). They have different needs and challenges particularly with regard to institutional frameworks and capacity, as well as the base of climate and hydro-met information needed. This needs to be reflected both in Component 1 – with regard to the equipment proposed, as well as Component 2 – particularly Outputs 2.1 and 2.4.
2. With regard to early warning systems, it is important to include education and communication of vulnerable communities so that their ability to interpret, and confidence in warning information is enhanced. In a number of instances, farmers may be reluctant to use EWS if they have found weather forecasts to be unreliable in the past (e.g. farmers waited to do a certain activity because of a rainfall forecast on a certain day which did not materialize, and from that moment onwards stopped using forecasts altogether). Hence, as a large part of this project relies on climate information dissemination, it will be essential to integrate stakeholders in the development process so that they understand the nature of the information provided and can make better use of it. Further, while the PIF notes the expense involved in (Doppler) weather radar; the alternative of using lightning data needs to be properly assessed in terms of the precipitation characteristics in Guinea.

3. With regard to the use of climate information to support long-term planning and resilience interventions, it would be useful to draw upon the recent literature that describes robust conclusions with regard to climate change outcomes for the region. See, for example, Sylla, Mouhamadou Bamba, Nellie Elguindi, Filippo Giorgi, and Dominik Wisser. "Projected robust shift of climate zones over West Africa in response to anthropogenic climate change for the late 21st century." *Climatic Change* 134, no. 1-2 (2016): 241-253.
4. STAP commends the forward-thinking approach of this project to ensure the greatest penetration of rural areas through the use of cell-phones. A number of projects across Africa are underway to implement EWS, and not only for climate. Some projects in East Africa use cell-phone based approaches to rapidly communicate the emergence of pests and diseases. Linking with these projects may be relevant, if not in their outputs, at least in terms of lessons learnt.
5. A number of new hydrological monitoring stations and automatic weather stations are planned to be constructed. While it has been mentioned that personnel will be trained to operate these, it will be first essential to gain a better understanding of why already existing structures have deteriorated to the point of being unusable. Similarly, it would be important to assess the reasons why agro-meteorological support to farmers is currently ineffective.

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