

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: August 18, 2014
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:	5868
PROJECT DURATION:	3
COUNTRIES:	Global
PROJECT TITLE:	Expanding the Ongoing Support to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) with Country-driven Processes to Advance National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP and UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	NAPGSP Phase I partner organizations
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 UNEP and UNDP proposal "Expanding the ongoing support to least developed countries (LDCs) with country-driven processes to advance National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)." The proposal aims to strengthen the capacities of LDC institutions to start and/or advance their NAP process. The proposed project will build on the ongoing global support program (GSP) funded by the LDCF and implemented by UNDP and UNEP. The experience from the GSP process informed a well-developed proposal that focuses on designing a project to ensure LDCs receive the necessary support and technical information to enhance resilience to climate change.

To further strengthen the project, STAP recommends addressing the following.

1. In the full proposal STAP recommends considering including more information on how relevant and useful technical information will be identified, packaged, and communicated. The PIF notes that continuous updating of information and data will be necessary, but does not indicate how that will be accomplished. The PIF notes the full project may partner with UNFPA on their DECA tool to provide fine scale information in GIS format. While it could be very useful to have such information, the DECA website shows the tool has only been developed for two countries. It would be useful for the full proposal to describe how the project will balance the needs of funding development of more user-friendly, finer scale information and providing the one-on-one support the PIF indicates many LDCs need.

2. While not explicitly discussed, medium to longer-term adaptation options require consideration of projected changes in climate change, including extreme weather and climate events, and consideration of how development patterns could alter vulnerability. UNEP and UNDP could consider developing regional and/or sectoral scenarios including emission pathways (RCPs) and shared socioeconomic pathways (SSPs) that can inform identifying adaptation options robust against a range of future climates and societal changes.

Further information on the development of these new climate scenarios can be found at <http://www2.cgd.ucar.edu/research/iconics>.

3. STAP also recommends the full proposal expand on how coordination will be facilitated across the wide range of UN agencies, NGOs, and other organizations the project intends to include. It would not be practical to include all possible actors in the PIF, but the full proposal could indicate how it would build on adaptation capacity building work being supported by the various UN agencies, START, CDKN, and others. Further, Annex III fails to mention initiatives by WHO and has limited coverage of initiatives by FAO, the World Bank, and the regional banks. Presumably initiatives by other UN organizations also are incomplete. STAP recommends further consideration in the full proposal of how the proposed project will fit in with similar efforts, to ensure maximum coordination.

4. The PIF states in paragraph 7 that PROVIA has an initiative to strengthen national institutional capacities for vulnerability assessment and adaptation planning and to support national efforts to integrate climate change adaptation measures into development planning. However, all other statements indicate that what PROVIA has produced in a vulnerability assessment guidance document. It would be useful in the full proposal to clarify PROVIA's role.

5. STAP recommends that the full proposal include approaches to ensure the NAPs include all sectors. Many NAPAs focused on a limited number of sectors, which often meant that critical areas of the economy and of well-being were not included in adaptation planning processes, thus limiting efforts to increase resilience. For example, paragraph 16 notes the importance of including planning, finance, and environment ministers in the NAP process. Disaster risk management, health, and other sectors also need to be included.

6. The full proposal also should include discussion of how support for the NAP process will ensure representation of women and other vulnerable groups. STAP hopes the gender aspects will be further developed and specified in the full proposal.

7. There are several mentions of the importance of capturing best practices and lessons learned, but without description of the criteria that will be used to determine a practice is "best" and by whom.

8. It would be helpful for the full proposal to provide the criteria that will be applied to determine which LDCs will be supported.

9. STAP recommends that project indicators be developed for the full proposal. Further, it would be helpful to include an evaluation of the proposed project at the end of the project to capture lessons learned that could be used to inform future adaptation support.

<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. (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. 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.
3. Major issues to be	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

considered during project design	<p>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>
---	---