

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: January 12, 2015
Screener: Veronique Morin
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:	6912
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Comoros
PROJECT TITLE:	Strengthening Comoros Resilience Against Climate Change and Variability Related Disaster
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	DGSC
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):
Major issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the UNDP proposal "Strengthening Comoros resilience against climate change and variability related disaster". The proposed project aims to strengthen the adaptive capacity and build resilience of communities vulnerable to climate related disaster risks, through implementation of the following three main project components: (1) building institutional capacity, (2) building knowledge on climate related disaster risks and vulnerability and (3) strengthening the resilience of livelihoods and assets of vulnerable communities. STAP is pleased to see this proposal, which seeks to reduce the vulnerability of the archipelago small island nation of Comoros to the many climate-induced natural hazards that face the country.

The main reason for recommending this proposal as a "Major Revision" is the lack of clarity regarding the inclusion of tsunami and volcanic hazards as climate change induced hazards. Regarding this, STAP has the following concerns, and requests the UNDP to further elaborate and focus the proposal on climate induced hazards during the development of the project.

ï€- On Page 4, tsunamis are referred to as "weather and climate extreme events, which are expected to increase in frequency and intensity in the future" Tsunamis are triggered by earthquake and not a climatic phenomenon. There is no scientific data to support that they are expected to increase in frequency and intensity in the future. STAP understands that sea level rise may exacerbate tsunami impacts, but that the relative impact of SLR compared to the scale of tsunami events is rather small.

ï€- Similarly on page 5 under point (iii) in Baseline Conditions, it is unclear how the project will or could integrate climate concerns into the tsunami relief plan.

ï€- On page 5 under point (ii) in Baseline Conditions, it is unclear how integrating a system for long term monitoring of volcano activities relates to climate change concerns, or how climate change risks may affect the efficiency of response to volcanic hazards.

ï€- Under the Alternative Scenario in Outcome # 1(iii), the PIF indicates that long term climate induced disaster risks will be integrated into the UNDP baseline project, which include the Karthala Volcano Plan and the tsunami relief plan. It is unclear how climate change risks are relevant to these disaster plans.

ï€- Under the Alternative Scenario in Outcome # 2, the PIF states that LDCF resources will be used to finance "seven modern seismological stations, three GPS/GNSS permanent stations, two surveillance cameras and CO2 station", as well as provide training of five OVK technical staff on how to integrate climate projections into volcanic monitoring activity. It is unclear how the volcanic hazards are related to climate change concerns.

In addition to the above, STAP recommends that the following points be addressed during the development of the proposal to further strengthen the scientific and technical underpinnings:

ï€- Page 4, under Baseline Conditions, climate projections could be updated by using the newest information from IPCC's WG II AR5, chapter 29. http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar5/wg2/WGIIAR5-Chap29_FINAL.pdf

ï€- On page 7, Outcome 2 speaks to risk mapping and modelling. Risk is the product of hazard and vulnerability. The output appears to describe hazard (rather than risk) mapping and modelling. The type of modelling should be clarified and elaborated. If the output is to include vulnerability and describe risk, then the components of vulnerability that are being examined should be clearly described.

ï€- Under Outcome 2, the STAP welcomes the initiative to build the human capacity of the DGM through training and recommends that collaboration and coordination with the Regional Specialized Monitoring Centre (RSMC) in Reunion be strengthened. It would be helpful for the full proposal to more fully describe the training components of the proposed project. STAP also suggests that the human capacity building activity consider methods to ensure sustainability of the training activities, such that new officials can gain expertise from trained DGM staff.

ï€- Under Outcome 3, one of the LDCF project activities proposes to dredge approximately 10 rivers for flood mitigation purposes. Given the potentially high sedimentation rates, it is recommended that the design life of such dredging activities be fully considered. Additionally, the environmental risks associated with dredging, which has the potential to negatively impact habitats and aquatic ecosystems, should be included in the full proposal, as well as methods for safeguarding.

ï€- STAP appreciates the mention of activities targeted for vulnerable women and the young, and encourages UNDP to integrate gender aspects throughout the project. Specifically, gender considerations should also be built in within Component One of the Project, which aims to build capacity of officials working at national agencies/institutions.

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

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