

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: October 01, 2013

Screeener: 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: 5523

PROJECT DURATION : 4

COUNTRIES : Antigua And Barbuda

PROJECT TITLE: Building climate Resilience through Innovative Financing Mechanisms for Climate Change Adaptation

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Housing and the Environment

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 revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes UNEP's SCCF proposal "Building climate resilience through innovative financing mechanisms for climate". The project objective is defined clearly and is supported by the proposed components. The STAP also appreciates a clear articulation of the problem statement, baseline scenario, and the literature cited (including Antigua and Barbuda's Second National Communication on Climate Change) in support of the project design.

To strengthen the proposal, STAP recommends addressing the following points during the full development of the concept "â€œ

1. While the PIF provides a good description of outputs and outcomes (Annex II), it would be good to elaborate potential indicators and metrics for the outputs and outcomes (for example "â€œ number of communities trained to implement adaptation "â€œ component 3). This will help measure and monitor the intended activity. Additionally, the project developers may wish to review the expected outputs since some appear to be outcomes (example "â€œ enhanced technical capacity, output 2.3).
2. In the project description, it would be helpful to further describe the threats to ecosystem functioning. At the moment, these are defined briefly. STAP also recommends describing the socio-economic conditions of the targeted areas and providing socio-economic indicators disaggregated by gender wherever possible. This data can be used to further inform the design and implementation of the project. Additionally, it would be useful to describe the general climate in Antigua and Barbuda, and provide some data on trends or projections on climate change. This information could be obtained at the World Bank's Climate Change Knowledge Portal "â€œ http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm?page=climate_data ; which includes (for example) UNDP's climate change country profiles "â€œ <http://www.geog.ox.ac.uk/research/climate/projects/undp-cp/> among other tools. 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.
3. In addition, to strengthen further the rationale for the additional cost reasoning and define more clearly the adaptation benefits, STAP recommends specifying further the following aspects throughout the proposal, particularly in component 3 "â€œ i) define more explicitly the communities facing climate change risks (flooding, droughts, others) ; ii) why (and how) these communities are vulnerable to climate change risks (flooding, droughts, others); iii) how will each proposed adaptation measures (flood risk management, sustainable land management, coastal management) reduce the communities' vulnerability to flooding, drought and/or increase their adaptive capacity to address climate risks.

Currently, some of these activities are detailed only in Annex II. STAP believes these concepts “defining the vulnerability context of the affected communities, the impacts of climate change on the communities and their livelihood responses” are integral to designing adaptation strategies. Thus, STAP encourages the project developers to define these aspects further in the full proposal. Given the focus on communities, a sustainable livelihoods framework may be useful for identifying the determinants of vulnerability and pathways for climate impacts. An example of how a sustainable livelihoods approach can be used to understand the impacts of climate variability and climate change on communities is discussed in the following source, which the project developers may wish to use: Badjeck, M.C. et al. "Impacts of climate change variability and change on fishery-based livelihoods". Marine Policy 34, pages 375-383. 2010. The project developers also may wish to consult further the GEF's "Operational Guidelines on Ecosystem-Based Approaches to Adaptation", GEF/LDCF.SCCF.13/Inf.06. October 2012.

4. Additionally, this data will assist the project's monitoring, evaluation and knowledge learning on the effects of the ecosystem based adaption 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 (components 3 and 4).

5. Furthermore, STAP recommends specifying the stakeholders' roles (identified in section A.2) in relation to the project's components “specifying the stakeholders' comparative advantages.

6. STAP encourages the project developers to consider the gender dimensions of non-timber forest products. In some instances, the literature suggests that women are more significantly involved more than men in the NTFPs value chain (Neumann, R. and E. Hirsch. Commercialisation of Non-Timber Forest Products: Review and Analysis of Research. CIFOR. 2000). Thus, STAP suggests to detail explicitly the gender dimensions of NTFP harvesting and commercialization, and how they contribute to socioeconomic and adaptation benefits. A good reference for guidance on gender dimensions is the 40-page publication from IFAD in 2008: Gender and non-timber forest products: Promoting food security and economic empowerment. It highlights the key issues on the role of women in NTFPs and contains a useful bibliography.

7. Under risks, STAP suggests defining explicitly the socio-economic and ecological characteristics of the target sites as mentioned in point #2. Thus, STAP believes these aspects are integral to the proposal and perhaps should not be considered as a mitigation response (see “The project's implementation measures will consider site-specific socio-economic and ecological conditions).

8. Additionally, STAP encourages for the project developers to consider the negative externalities (or mal-adaptations) that may occur as a result of an adaptive strategy (example “flood control) in one sector that hampers the response measure in a different sector (example “fish production may decline). Perhaps component 3 can be developed using a multi-sector approach to adaptation, and the threats of negative externalities be covered in the risk section.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	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.
2. Minor revision required.	STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development. Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency: (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.
3. Major revision required	STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design. Follow-up: (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. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.

