

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:	8013
PROJECT DURATION:	4
COUNTRIES:	Malawi
PROJECT TITLE:	Climate Adaptation for Sustainable Water Supply
GEF AGENCIES:	AfDB
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:	
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 AfDB proposal "Climate adaptation for sustainable water supply." The proposal aims to ensure the sustainability of water supply in the river courses and climate proof the water resources outputs of the baseline investment in five districts by either scaling up or enforcing activities planned under the baseline project.

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

1. The objective of the project is to increase community and water supply resilience to climate change. 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.
2. It would be helpful if the project components could be matched with the CCA objectives, to better understand which components are intended to address which objectives.
3. STAP recommends updating the statements on the vulnerability of Malawi to climate variability and change to the IPCC 5th Assessment Report; the PIF cites literature published in 2001. In addition, it would be helpful to include any evidence of impacts of climate variability and change in the pilot districts.
4. STAP would appreciate further clarity on what was accomplished under the baseline project, particularly with respect to the adaptation measures undertaken. Given the baseline project ended in 2013, there may be any opportunity to review the effectiveness and sustainability of the adaptation measures undertaken.

5. 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.
6. STAP suggests including a health expert in Component 2 to evaluate whether there is a risk that specific interventions to protect catchments could increase the numbers of cases of vectorborne and waterborne diseases, such as malaria. If there is a risk, then additional efforts may be needed as part of the project and a representative from the ministry of health may need to be included among the key stakeholders.
7. STAP looks forward to more information in the full proposal on how best practices and lessons learned will be identified in Component 3, including the criteria to be used and who will do the identification. STAP also looks forward to information on indicators for monitoring and evaluating the activities that will be undertaken during the project, and for measuring the benefit of the interventions.
8. It would be helpful in the full proposal to provide further explanation of how the enabling environment for community-based adaptation will be strengthened, and how that strengthening will be monitored and evaluated.
9. The incremental reasoning suggests resilience will be increased to droughts and floods, but there doesn't appear to be an activity to develop and deploy early warning systems, or, if not, to train communities on appropriate responses to weather forecasts.
10. The incremental reasoning also suggests that the project will bring in "additional adaptation activities." It would be helpful to provide more information on what is intended.
11. STAP encourages including an explicit activity to develop a plan for scaling-up, including the amount of human and financial resources required.
12. STAP appreciates the attention to gender considerations throughout the proposed project and the indicators that will be monitored. STAP looks forward to further development of this aspect in the full proposal.
13. It would be helpful for the full proposal to include details on how the proposed project will coordinate with the two other climate change adaptation being implemented, and how the outcomes of those projects, such as a comprehensive vulnerability analysis and socioeconomic scenarios to identify adaptation priorities, will inform the full project.

<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>
-----------------------	---