

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 03, 2016
Screener: Veronique Morin
Panel member validation by: Anand Patwardhan
Consultant(s): sarah Lebel

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT	LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	6988
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Guinea-Bissau
PROJECT TITLE:	Strengthening the Resilience of Vulnerable Coastal Areas and Communities to Climate Change in Guinea Bissau
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Secretary of State for Environment and Tourism
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 the resilience of vulnerable coastal areas and communities to climate change in Guinea Bissau". This project aims to build Guinea Bissau's institutional capacity to manage climate risk in coastal areas, as well as improve the coastal protection infrastructure and increase coastal communities' resilience to climate impacts. While the proposed project addresses critical sectors in a highly vulnerable country, STAP is concerned about the lack of specificity about some of the investment-related interventions (components #2 and #3 of the PIF) and the way in which the project will lead to more effective mainstreaming of adaptation concerns. For this reason, STAP's overall advisory response is "minor revision". STAP would like to offer the following observations for considering during the course of project development:

1. While assessing risks, the first risk relates to climate science and risk information availability. STAP believes it is unlikely that the suggested mitigation measures (i.e. a coastal zone monitoring programme) will address the identified risk. STAP recommends, in terms of mitigation measures, to have a look at available climate datasets through a number of publicly-available platforms (e.g. CORDEX, CMIP5), the IPCC AR5, and engage with modeling groups who could help downscale climate information to the relevant scale for national, regional, and local planning. Such approaches could be as simple as using coarse-scale data from General Circulation Models into weather generators. It should be attempted to partner with local research institutions and universities who could complement these climate data analyses with thorough impacts simulations. Although it is recommended to use CMIP5 datasets as a starting point, already processed older climate datasets, based on the 4th Assessment report of the IPCC (AR4), of daily downscaled GCM data can also be found here:

http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm?page=forthcoming_downscaled_data. STAP welcomes the involvement of local knowledge partners (IBAP, INPA, INEP, CIPA) and encourages the project to strengthen human and institutional capacity in these organizations.

2. In outcome 2, STAP would encourage further consideration of ecosystem-based adaptation as an approach that could provide sea level rise protection benefits as well as strengthening the resource base for livelihood activities. STAP appreciates the use of native and indigenous species and mangrove restoration in outputs 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 and recommends that further consideration be given to the linkages between resource management and resource-dependent livelihoods. STAP also welcomes the desire to avoid mal-adaptation. Better coordination between outcomes 2 and 3 would be helpful in this regard.

3. The PIF does note the political and institutional instability and in this regard, STAP would encourage consideration of local institutional strengthening as a means for insulating project activities and benefits from political and governance issues.

4. Finally, the project may consider data safeguarding and dissemination options, such as making data on coastal processes publicly available on digital platform, in order to ensure that reliable information remains available beyond the project life and can continue to benefit communities in the longer term for planning purposes, amongst others.

<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. (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>