

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 19, 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:	6926
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Lesotho
PROJECT TITLE:	Strengthening Climate Services in Lesotho for Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change
GEF AGENCIES:	UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	Lesotho Meteorological Services (primary executing partner), Disaster Management Authority, Ministry of Energy, Meteorology and Water Affairs
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 UNEP proposal "Strengthening climate services in Lesotho for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change (2nd phase of the LMS/GEF/UNEP LDCF NAPA Early Warning Project." The proposal aims to scale up the existing Early Warning Project's coverage to the entire country through procurement of additional modern equipment/technology and through provision of additional support for the improvement of the institutional and human capacity needed to develop and operationalize an effect climate change early warning system.

Issues that would strengthen a revised PIF include:

1. The proposal focuses on provision of technology and equipment (over \$3.5 million requested) based on a request by the Lesotho Meteorological Services. The PIF states that an independent assessment of needs will be conducted during the PPG. It is not clear how budget from that component would be reallocated to other activities if the full request is not necessary. In addition, the PIF lists several projects that also are providing technology and equipment. A table summarizing recent and planned installations would be helpful to understand needs.

2. The PIF should clearly summarize the status of the first phase of the LMS/GEF/UNEP LDCF NAPA Early Warning Project, including what has been accomplished for the \$1.7 million already invested. It appears the project is behind schedule, but limited information is provided. The PIF indicates needs assessments and baseline studies conducted for the Early Warning Project will be used, but these are not described further. In addition, the PIF states a recent WMO/UNFCCC audit identified a wide range of challenges to meteorological services in Lesotho, including human errors at monitoring stations, vandalism, poor communication facilities, and poor data archiving. The PIF states the audit did not include the LMS/GEF/UNEP LDCF NAPA Early Warning Project, but it would be helpful for the PIF to outline any

challenges experienced with the implementation to better assess what the proposed project will need to address in terms of effective implementation, risks, and mitigation measures.

3. STAP strongly supports establishing an Early Warning System Task Team, but suggests that preliminary efforts should begin before the PIF is finalized.
4. Multiple statements in the PIF suggest that potential stakeholders have not been contacted to ensure engagement and buy-in for the project. STAP strongly recommends contacting the sectors that will be engaged in the proposed project before finalizing the PIF to understand their needs for an early warning system and to obtain their endorsement of the proposed project. It also would be important to understand their training and capacity building needs to be able to use the proposed early warning system, so that those needs could be built into the project from the beginning. In addition, there should be verification that these sectors have the financial and human resources to participate through in-kind contributions.
5. The alternative scenario for Component 1 states that additional equipment will support data at the spatial and temporal resolution recommended for optimal functionality. What is that resolution and how was it chosen? Is that the scale that would be useful to the other sectors who would be engaged in the proposed project?
6. The PIF implies that just one early warning system will be developed, but that is not the experience elsewhere where early warning systems for agriculture differ from those for water resources, which can differ from those for forestry, etc. Again, early engagement with stakeholders will be critical for effective project design and implementation.
7. Statements to the effect that relevant user institutions will be encouraged to expand their staff base to facilitate uptake and use of the climate services that will be offered, are inconsistent with lessons learned from other countries on developing and deploying early warning systems. It is unreasonable to expect other ministries and institutions with their own significant constraints on human and financial resources will be able to expand their staff base, even more so if they are not engaged with developing the climate services from the beginning.
8. STAP recommends clarifying the risks and mitigation measures. Some, such as the theft and vandalism of equipment, include mitigation measures (in this case, climate observers) that apparently already exist (as stated elsewhere) so it is unclear what the proposed project will do differently to reduce risks. Some of the risk ratings appear inconsistent with other information in the PIF.
9. The UNEP LIVE portal is not tied to the proposed project, so it is unclear how it would be used.
10. While the STAP appreciates the efforts to include gender into the proposed project, the description does not tie in with the rest of the PIF. For example, the PIF indicates that it expects two additional staff to be hired, which makes ensuring a gender balance challenging at best. There also is mention of collecting gender-disaggregated data, but it is not clear what data are being collected other than weather data. The text also talks about pilot communities, but the PIF is for a national early warning system, so it is not clear how that relates.

<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.

	<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>