

# 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: March 09, 2015  
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:	5904
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Benin
PROJECT TITLE:	Strengthening the Resilience of Rural Livelihoods and Sub-national Government System to Climate Risks and Variability in Benin
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	
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 "Strengthening the resilience of rural livelihoods and sub-national government system to climate risks and variability in Benin." The proposal aims to build capacities and increase the preparedness of national and sub-national authorities to effectively identify, sequence, and combine available resources for addressing climate change adaptation, while addressing the country's highest priority actions identified in the Benin NAPA. STAP appreciates UNDP submitting a comprehensive, clear, and concise PIF.

STAP looks forward to further details in the full proposal. Issues that should be addressed in the full proposal include:

1. STAP would appreciate fuller details on which climate change projections will be used in the proposed project, including the time frame(s) of interest and why particular model(s) were chosen. It would be helpful to know who will choose the models and how the projections will be communicated to the stakeholders. It also would be helpful to incorporate different possible future socioeconomic development pathways when considering which adaptation options could be more resilient in coming decades.
2. Component 1 states it will include developing and providing climate smart tools, methods, and mentorships. It would be helpful for the full project proposal to include details about these methods and tools, how it will be determined that they are appropriate, the extent of stakeholder engagement in that determination, and how they will be deployed, monitored, and evaluated.
3. STAP cautions that implementation of irrigation channels and drainage systems for flood prevention are associated with increased rates of malaria in other regions. It would be important for the project to include the Ministry of Health as a key stakeholder and to possibly include a health expert to consult on potential

adverse health consequences of different types of agricultural infrastructure. Further, the technical training could include a component to raise awareness of the potential health impacts of adaptation activities in agriculture.

4. In the full proposal, STAP suggests providing additional information on:
  - a. How community needs and preferences will be determined and taken into account in the project outputs.
  - b. The indicators that will be used for monitoring and evaluating how the project is doing.
  - c. How best practices and lessons learned will be determined and shared within the project and more broadly.
  - d. The design, conduct, monitoring, and evaluation of the mentoring program.
  - e. The objective tools that will be embedded in the VRA.
  - f. The design, conduct, monitoring, and evaluation of the incentive mechanism.
  - g. How the resilience of agricultural techniques will be determined.
  - h. How the project will coordinate with on-going initiatives.
  
5. STAP encourages including an explicit activity to develop a plan for scaling-up, including the amount of human and financial resources required.
  
6. STAP appreciates the comprehensive efforts to include gender throughout the PIF and looks forward to further development of this aspect in the full project proposal. However, it was surprising given this strong focus that the Ministry for Women Affairs was not listed as a key stakeholder.

<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.</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>	<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>