

# 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: September 23, 2014  
Screener: Kristie Ebi  
Panel member validation by: Anand Patwardhan  
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT	LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FUND
GEF PROJECT ID:	5695
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Tanzania
PROJECT TITLE:	Ecosystem-Based Adaptation for Rural Resilience
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, Ministry of Water, VPO-DOE, NEMC, LGAs
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 UNEP proposal "Ecosystem-based adaptation for rural resilience." The proposal aims to strengthen climate resilience in rural communities of Tanzania by building adaptive capacities to implement EbA approaches and diversifying livelihoods. The PIF provides detailed justification for the project and a broad outline of the intended activities.

To further strengthen the full proposal, STAP recommends addressing the following.

1. The STAP recommends moving beyond general descriptions of the vulnerability of the rural districts of the central plateau and Zanzibar, and include specifics of what is intended in the project and how it would be accomplished. Further, the PIF was not clear on the extent to which the proposed project would focus on supplementing the ASDP and WSDP, and the extent to which it would include other activities. Additional clarity would be helpful.
2. Because the effectiveness of adaptation actions will be influenced by assumptions about the magnitude and pattern of changing weather patterns, STAP recommends including description of the climate projections and the scenarios that will be used, including the rationale for the choices made. The STAP suggests using where possible the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs) being developed as part of the new climate change scenario process; these describe a range of possible development pathways, including qualitative descriptions and quantitative variables such as demographic growth, education, and GDP <http://www.isp.ucar.edu/iconics>. Although the SSPs are described on the global scale, several EU projects were recently initiated to develop regional extensions that could provide input for the descriptions of future socio-economic-environmental conditions used in the project.
3. The STAP recommends the full proposal provide further details on how local to national scales will be linked. The PIF discusses each scale separately, without a clear plan for how the scales would be linked.

4. The PIF makes several mentions of increasing scientific knowledge. Doing so could provide potential benefits. However, the PIF does not mention universities and colleges as possible stakeholders. For example, the Sokoine University of Agriculture, located in Morogoro, has projects on climate change and food security that work with local communities, including on increasing the use of traditional foods during times of food insecurity. At a minimum, the full proposal should build on the work already conducted. Including the university as a stakeholder might facilitate identification of funds for research to further support the project.

5. Because many of the EbA activities identified could affect breeding grounds for the vectors that carry diseases such as malaria or could affect the transmission of infectious diseases, it would be important for the Ministry of Health to be among the key stakeholders. UNEP could explore the extent to which the WHO Africa Regional Office could provide technical support to the Ministry of Health for activities such as conducting the vulnerability and adaptation assessment.

6. STAP welcomes the mention of the importance of gender and looks forward to further development of how gender will be taken into consideration in the full project. It would be helpful to include criteria for ensuring women are included in project activities, to specify how gender-differentiated activities would be designed, and to include indicators for monitoring the success of these activities for women.

7. It would be helpful for the full proposal to provide information on how the proposed project would link with on-going and planned GEF initiatives and other projects.

8. STAP assumes the full project proposal will include detailed information on the activities to be implemented, the location of pilot projects, the numbers of individuals trained, the timeline to be followed, and how the progress of the project will be monitored and evaluated.

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

