

# 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: June 18, 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:	8001
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Chad
PROJECT TITLE:	Community-based Climate Risks Management in Chad
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Ministry of Agriculture and Environment, UNCDF
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 "Community-based climate risks management in Chad." The proposal aims to strengthen the responsiveness capacity of vulnerable populations to better cope with climate shocks by responding earlier to warning signals and adopting financial risk transfer mechanisms.

The PIF provides a broad overview of the proposed project so the 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 of the magnitude and pattern of extreme weather and climate events in coming decades will be used, 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 a range of possible future socioeconomic development pathways (e.g. Shared Socioeconomic Pathways) when considering approaches to structuring the financial risk transfer mechanisms, to increase the likelihood of their resilience in a changing climate.
2. In Component 1:
  - a. STAP would appreciate further details on the selection criteria for choosing the pilot sites, and how the activities in those sites will be coordinated with other on going or planned adaptation projects
  - b. STAP also would appreciate consideration of how to develop the community-based early warning systems so they can be modified as the frequency and intensity of extreme weather and climate events changes.
  - c. It would be helpful to consider the extent to which the community-based early warning systems should be similar across the country.
  - d. The overview of this component suggests a top-down structure, with national agencies providing information on climate risks and with communities then taking action. It could be helpful to consider how to

collect feedback from communities to national agencies on where improvements in knowledge transfer, coordination, and other elements would enhance the effectiveness of the early warning systems.

e. The full proposal should indicate which NGOs and other actors will be involved in the outputs.

f. It would be helpful to have a map of the communities involved in this component.

g. Note that paragraph 14 states that there will be at least 2,500 target communities and individuals, and that 100,000 lives will be saved in each region (time frame not specified). Earlier statements don't support hundreds of thousands of lives lost to extreme weather and climate events.

h. Page 10 mentions at the end of A.5 that the proposed project might purchase additional hydro-meteorological equipment. STAP would appreciate more information in the full proposal, including the amount, type, where it will be installed, and the maintenance plan.

3. In Component 2, STAP would appreciate further details on how this outcome will be accomplished. Examples include who will undertake the structural analysis of markets and institutions, who will decide which risk transfer mechanisms would be best suited to the needs of the communities, how the schemes and instruments will be chosen (and by whom), who will design and implement education and capacity building activities, what criteria will be used for evaluation of the risk transfer mechanisms, and how the cross-community sharing mechanisms will be designed, promoted, and evaluated.

4. It would be helpful for the full proposal to include further details on how the activities within the components will be accomplished, who will undertake these activities, the methods that will be used, and the number of pilot sites that will be included.

5. With the interest in food and water security, the Ministry of Health and other health experts would bring valuable contributions to project design and evaluation, to help ensure choices made also promote human health and well-being.

6. STAP looks forward to more information in the full proposal on how best practices and lessons learned will be identified, including the criteria to be used and who will do the identification. STAP also looks forward to information on indicators for monitoring, evaluating, and learning from the activities that will be undertaken, and for measuring the benefit of the interventions.

7. STAP encourages including an explicit activity to develop a plan for scaling-up, including estimating the human and financial resources required.

8. STAP appreciates the attention to include gender considerations in the proposed project and looks forward to further development of this aspect in the full proposal.

9. In section A.4 (Risk), it was surprising that the identified risks did not include an extreme weather or climate event occurring during the project, particularly with the descriptions of the vulnerability of the country to such events. It would be helpful to consider what planning would be helpful for reducing the consequences of an extreme event during project implementation.

10. Given the large number of on-going or planned adaptation projects, STAP would appreciate a more comprehensive explanation of how coordination and collaboration will be fostered across the projects.

<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:  (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>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>
<p><b>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</b></p>	<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>