

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:	9041
PROJECT DURATION:	5
COUNTRIES:	Kiribati
PROJECT TITLE:	Enhancing "whole of islands" Approach to Strengthen Community Resilience to Climate and Disaster Risks in Kiribati
GEF AGENCIES:	UNDP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Office of Te Berentitenti (OB) Kiribati
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 "Enhancing "whole of islands" approach to strengthen community resilience to climate and disaster risks in Kiribati." The proposal aims to address the urgent and immediate adaptation priorities under the NAPA, initiate the implementation of the Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (JIP) process, and kick-start the medium- to long-term National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process to ensure that the development under the Kiribati Development Plan (KDP).

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

1. The PIF provides a broad overview of the proposed project, naming indicative outputs. Although the budget is fairly large, it would be important in the full proposal to ensure the outcomes and outputs can be realistically achieved with the available human and financial resources.
2. 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.
3. STAP would appreciate fuller details on which climate change projections 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 different possible future socioeconomic development pathways (e.g. Shared Socioeconomic Pathways) when considering which adaptation options could be more resilient in coming decades.

4. In Component 1, STAP would appreciate descriptions of who will undertake the outputs and how they will be accomplished.
5. In Component 2, STAP would appreciate further details on the selection criteria for selecting the pilot sites, and how the activities in those sites will be coordinated with other on going or planned adaptation projects.
6. In Component 3, STAP suggests considering including representatives from the ministry of health or other health experts to ensure that outputs on food and water security also promote human health and well-being. For example, water storage systems could increase the numbers of cases of vectorborne and waterborne diseases, such as dengue. If such a risk is likely, then additional efforts may be needed as part of the project.
7. 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. It also would be helpful to provide the criteria that will be used to select the techniques, technologies, and solutions tested elsewhere for implementation in the proposed project.
8. 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.
9. STAP encourages including an explicit activity to develop a plan for scaling-up, including estimating the human and financial resources required.
10. STAP appreciates the attention to gender considerations throughout the PIF and looks forward to further development of this aspect in the full proposal.
11. It would be helpful for the full proposal to provide greater clarity on the co-financing. For example, Section C of the PIF states that NZAP will in-kind co-financing of \$10M. However, page 12 lists one NZ project of \$5,000.
12. In the section on project risks (page 14), the mitigation measure for the second risk (unsustainable implementation practices) doesn't really explain how that risk would be managed and reduced.

<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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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>
3. Major issues to be considered during	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:

project design	<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>
-----------------------	---