

# 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:	8020
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Niger
PROJECT TITLE:	Planning and Financing Adaptation in Niger
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	National Council on Environment for Sustainable Development (CNEDD)
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 "Planning and financing adaptation in Niger". The project is divided into three components, aimed at engaging and enabling stakeholders to implement the NAP process develop sustainable water infrastructure, and enabling evidenced-based policy decisions. STAP believes the PIF to be scientifically and technically sound, with an excellent basis for project justification and well-developed project components.

STAP would like to suggest the following, to further strengthen the project:

1. Under Output 1.2, the focus is on getting a good understanding of climate change adaptation through to stakeholders. However, Component 3 is all about building evidence-based policy decisions. STAP believes that one cannot be achieved without the other. That is, getting a grasp on climate change adaptation will rely on having a good understanding of climate science, projections, and uncertainties. Activities under Output 1.2 and Component 3 should therefore not be conducted independently, and should remain tightly connected through the next stages of project design.
2. STAP welcomes the focus in Component 2 on water systems and improving water availability and access. We do recommend that in the process of project development, it would be helpful to draw from (and connect to) the substantial set of sustainable land management interventions in Niger; which share many of the same intervention modalities and objectives. Further, this component is really about access to adaptation finance at the local level; and the PIF does not elaborate how the interventions proposed (Outputs 2.1 and 2.2 are all about creating new infrastructure) would more generally improve provision of, and access to finance.
3. Finally, food security and livelihood security are important dimensions of building resilience. The project may want to draw from the substantial experience with social protection interventions, as they are likely to be relevant for both Components 1 and 3. See, for example:

Devereux, Stephen. "Social protection for enhanced food security in sub-Saharan Africa." *Food Policy* 60 (2016): 52-62.

Hoddinott, John, Susanna Sandström, and Joanna Upton. "The impact of cash and food transfers: Evidence from a randomized intervention in Niger." (2014).

<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>