

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 27, 2014

Screener: Kristie Ebi

Panel member validation by: Anand Patwardhan

Consultant(s): Guadalupe Duron

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT SPECIAL CLIMATE CHANGE FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5604

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Bosnia-Herzegovina

PROJECT TITLE: Technology Transfer for Climate Resilient Flood Management in Vrbas River Basin

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Bosnia and Herzegovina Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations

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 the UNDP proposal "Technology transfer for climate resilient flood management in Vrbas River Basin". The proposal aims to transfer technologies for climate resilient flood management in order to increase the resilience of highly exposed rural poor, returnee, and displaced persons in the Vrbas river basin. The PIF provides clear and often comprehensive descriptions of the current level of vulnerability and of ongoing projects that the proposal would capitalize on. However, in some places the activities to be undertaken are unclear or cannot be tracked across components and outcomes.

To further strengthen the proposal, STAP recommends addressing the following during its development.

1. The STAP recommends including a description of the current early warning system. It is mentioned in several places without a clear description of its current operation, other than it is manually based and ineffective, or how it would be improved through the project. Also mentioned are hazard maps, but it is unclear the extent to which they are used and useful.
2. Further, STAP strongly encourages the flood early warning system to consider more than thresholds for action, but also to provide a detailed response plan developed with all relevant stakeholders. In particular, the design of the EWS should ensure effective response, and monitoring of episodic events as well as longer-term changes in climate.
3. STAP also strongly encourages strengthening the proposal in terms of adaptive risk management. It is often unclear whether outcomes and outputs are focused solely on reducing current vulnerability or are also intent on increasing the capacity for adaptive management as the climate continues to change. For example, paragraph 61 states the project will ensure that climate change risks are properly incorporated into Emergency Flood Relief and Prevention Project, but without providing further information on how.
4. The flood mapping should consider not just current vulnerabilities, but also how those vulnerabilities could change under scenarios of climate change and development pathway. Paragraph 62 states that the maps will be used in the development of emergency preparedness and response plans, which would be a highly appropriate output, but further details are not provided
5. The flood risks management approaches could use better articulation, including the stakeholders involved, the process for developing and managing flood risks, and the time frame for the flood risk

management actions (e.g. covering flood risks through 2050). Further, paragraph 63 states the project will develop tools, methods, guidelines, and procedures for recording flood events, undertaking post-event surveys, and assessing vulnerability to flooding. This is another highly relevant output that is not developed further.

6. STAP recommends a more thorough discussion in the proposal of bio-engineered measures and other approaches for sustainable engineering solutions, and specification of the relevant adaptation technologies. Considering that the project addresses objective CCA-3 pertaining to technology transfer; further elaboration of technology transfer issues may be warranted. For example, long-term absorptive capacity is important to ensure that recipients have the ability to effectively use, modify and enhance deployed solutions. As noted in #3 above, adaptation is an on-going process and without an element of institutional capacity, particularly for modelling, forecasting and assessment, continued adaptation benefits may be difficult to obtain.

7. There are multiple, brief mentions of scenario development without detailing the goals, methods, and stakeholders to be involved. UNDP might consider modifying the storylines and quantifications of the new scenario process <http://www2.cgd.ucar.edu/research/iconics>, as required to be relevant for the project. The Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs) being developed as part of the new climate change scenario process describe a range of possible development pathways, including qualitative descriptions and quantitative variables such as demographic growth, education, and GDP. Although the SSPs are described on the global scale, they can be extended regionally and sectorally to provide input for the descriptions of future socio-economic-environmental conditions that would be relevant for scenario-based planning in the project.

8. The PIF mentions in several places the baseline situation includes unsustainable farming practices (e.g. paragraphs 19, 68, and others) without describing those practices, and does not clarify the proposed actions to increase sustainability. Similarly, the PIF mentions unsustainable floodplain development in the baseline situation without further clarification.

9. Since the PIF mentions the use of existing dams for hydropower, it may be appropriate to consider the energy supply risks associated with climate change. See, for example, Ostojic, G., Stankovski, S., Ratkovic, Z., Miladinovic, L., & Maksimovic, R. (2013). Development of hydro potential in Republic Srpska. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 28, 196-203.

10. The STAP recommends strengthening the discussions of how the national, regional, and local scale issues will be integrated. Some outputs will take place across local to national scales without a clear description of how the scales will be linked.

11. STAP encourages UNDP to strengthen the gender aspects of the project. The importance of gender is mentioned, without providing specifics as to how gender will be incorporated.

12. Another possible stakeholder is the Ministry of Health, to ensure that actions taken do not inadvertently increase health risks.

13. Other issues include:

a. A list of acronyms would be helpful.

b. The estimated population in the Vrbas river basin varies across the PIF, including when indicating the size of the vulnerable population (e.g. 33% of 510,000 is not 100,300). Recent and consistent estimates, including how many people live in rural areas and the number of returnees and other vulnerable groups would strengthen the proposal.

c. The PIF mentions the costs of recent floods (e.g. paragraph 13), without providing further details as to the specific impacts or providing a reference.

d. Paragraph 20 is one of several mentions of socially excluded groups without clarifying to whom this refers.

e. Paragraph 56 discusses the limited human capital, but does not revisit this issue in the output and outcomes to indicate how it will be addressed.

f. Several places mention there are "a number" of gauges that need repair. Quantification would be helpful during proposal development.

g. Paragraph 72 states Component 2 includes vulnerability surveys, but I could not find text to describe this issue.

- h. How will the project contribute to reconciliation within the country?
- i. Paragraph 88 mentions tools for long-term assessment of vulnerability. Where are these described?

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
2. Minor revision required.	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.